THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXXXI, No. 3 SEPTEMBER, 1954

CONTENTS

Technical Progress and Christian Morality according to the Teaching of the Sovereign Pontiff
Ernest Cardinal Ruffini 145

Mary, Ever-Virgin. Part I ..... *Thomas U. Mullaney, O.P.* 159

A Proposed Reform of the Calendar
Daniel J. K. O'Connell, S.J. 168

Are There "Less Encouraging" Papal Pronouncements?
Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. 172

The International Marian Academy
Alban A. Maguire, OF.M. 178

The American Priest Discovers American History
Thomas T. McAvoy, C.S.C. 180

The Papal Allocution *Si Diligis* ... *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 186

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
Walter J. Schmitz, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

The Eucharistic Fast 199

Holy Communion for the Mentally Retarded Child 199

Sanctuary Carpet 201

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1954, by the Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

Relics on the Altar 202
Similar Statues 202
The Holy Oils 203
Thirteen Hours' Devotion 203
Missa Cantata 203
Exposition Mass Problem 204
Candles around Coffin or Catafalque 204
Proper Dress for Holy Communion Distribution 205

ANALECTA 206

BOOK REVIEWS

Cardinal Gasquet. A Memoir, *by Shane Leslie* 209
The Catholic Church in World Affairs, *edited by Waldemar Gurian and M. A. Fitzsimons* 215
The Philosophy of Being, *by Rt. Rev. Louis de Raeymaeker* 216

EVERY CATHOLIC SCHOOL where HISTORY is taught
EVERY CATHOLIC LIBRARY
EVERY PRIEST
EVERY CATHOLIC interested in HISTORY

should be a regular subscriber to

The CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW

Official Organ of the American Catholic Historical Association

• **Articles By Leading Scholars** • **Historical Miscellany** • **Book Reviews**
• **Notes and Comments** • **Periodical Literature**

Recognized as the leading publication in its field. Published quarterly: January, April, July, October. Subscription rate: $5.00; single number $1.50.

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington 17, D. C.

TECHNICAL PROGRESS AND CHRISTIAN MORALITY ACCORDING TO THE TEACHING OF THE SOVEREIGN PONTIFF[1]

I consider myself highly honored to be able to speak today before such a prominent assemblage, and it is for me the highest honor to be the interpreter of the feelings we all share in offering homage to the Vicar of Jesus Christ, the Pope, who is the dearer to our hearts the less we have the opportunity today to hear his inspired admonitions, because he is ill. It is in the name particularly of my dear Sicily that I prostrate myself at the throne of the August Pontiff. That island, brilliant pearl of the Mediterranean, is resplendent because of the sea which surrounds it, the richness of the monuments which adorn it and the many thousands of years of history which make it illustrious. It is also magnificent for its constant and tenacious fidelity to the Chair of Peter.

We feel, more than a duty, a need to stand united with the Pope. We are but too convinced that without the Pope there is no Church, and without this there is no true Christianity. Unity shines forth in God and is reflected in the universe, which, though immeasurable in its profundity and in its extension, makes ever more evident the fusion of colors, the harmony of tones and the coordination of the laws which regulate its course, always in an admirable unity. One is the Person of the Redeemer, one and unique is the law of the Gospel, summing up in love the whole of perfection; and this divine mark could not be lacking from the work of Christ, the Church, of which the Pope is the indestructible foundation. In this union with the Pope consists our faith, our strength, the certainty of victory.

On this day which recalls the universal exultation of fifteen years ago, may the filial, fervent prayer which rises from our soul full of gratitude go out to His Holiness, while we beg of God, through the intercession of the Immaculate Virgin, that he may recover as we desire, and perfectly, for our comfort, and above all, for the greatest advantage of all peoples.

[1] Discourse delivered on the occasion of the solemn exercises in honor of the Sovereign Pontiff in the Auditorium of the *Palazzo Pio* promoted by the Pontifical Work of Assistance on the fifteenth anniversary of the Coronation of His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, March 12, 1954.

THE CHRISTMAS RADIO MESSAGE

The Encyclicals, the Constitutions and Letters Apostolic, the Discourses and the solemn Messages of Pius XII fill several volumes, imperishable monuments of a wisdom truly papal. A precious gem is the radio message, directed to the faithful of all the world on the occasion of last Christmas, on techniques and their dangers.

Therein, history, science, philosophy and theology are intertwined to give an exact idea of the present crisis, which results from the harsh conflict between two worlds: that of Religion which is the exaltation of the soul, and that of the technical spirit which is the exaltation of matter.

Man, as soon as he appears on the face of the earth, shows intelligence and a spirit of initiative. Fire, the little instruments made from stones and from the bones of animals, the careful burial of dead bodies, the remains of which show attempts at bone-setting, and even at trepanation, set him off immensely, even in the most remote epochs of prehistory, from the animals endowed with the most perfect instincts.

Using his intelligence, he has begun immediately to investigate, in order to discover them, the secrets of nature and applying them to the satisfaction of his needs of life and of development; he has given a start to techniques. This technique, in the beginning, naturally, was rudimentary and ingenuous, we might say infantile, but it was to grow and develop, as the tree from the seed, into the grandiose discoveries and into the stupendous machines of our present civilization.

Technique is based on the innumerable possibilities of nature and is translated into action by the inventive genius of man, which puts together various elements of the cosmos, directed to a well determined end, corresponding, in general, to some one of his needs.

Technique realizes a human idea and brings into the external world as it were a new creature, the product of his spirit.

One who wished to describe the progress of techniques from the beginnings to the present day would have to distinguish the period of the simple utensils or apparatuses which extends up to the fourteenth century of the Christian Era, the period of the machine which comes down to the modern age, and the period of the automatons, which is beginning in our times.

The polished stones and the bones of animals, made into instruments of defense and of offense, the terracotta vases, the hammer, the saw, the lever, wheels, the expressions of a primitive technical civilization imitated the muscular system and the members of man himself. Machines, from watches to mechanical looms for weaving, from the steam-pot of Papin to hydroelectric turbines, from the reflecting telescope of Newton to the electronic microscope, from the balloon of the Montgolfier brothers to jet airplanes, flying faster than 2,000 kilometers an hour, from the first horse-drawn railway of 1801 and the first gasoline automobile of 1907 to express trains and racing cars, from the extraction of petroleum in 1859 to the first atomic chain reaction, produced by our Fermi in 1938, from the elementary motion picture machine invented by Edison in 1881 to television, is all a dizzy course of mechanisms treading on each other's heels, which reproduce in the world of matter the movements of human metabolism, of the respiratory, the digestive, and the circulatory system.

We have now entered the epoch of the automatons, or regulated machines which transmit information, make calculations, automatically foresee and correct eventual difficulties, e.g. radio, machines for telecontrol, radar, the electronic brain which resolves equations and makes logarithmic calculations, the machine of MacCulloch which reads written characters, even manuscript, and transmits them to a loudspeaker. They are true nervous systems, even in the physical order, which man has succeeded in creating outside of himself.

RELIGION AND TECHNIQUE

Our holy Religion is not opposed to technical progress. Indeed, it favors it.

How many prejudices have had to be overcome and how many distorted customs have had to be corrected before arriving at the full freedom of which technique has need in order to evolve.

Animism which rendered nature almost inviolable, for it was considered, in its various elements to be in the possession and under the custody of benign or malignant spirits; the lack of interest in material things, most widespread above all in the East because of the teachings of Buddha; the transmigration of souls, and the belief which for many generations made people in a great

portion of the world believe in a perpetual return of things to their primitive state; fatalism which considered human efforts useless against destiny, were so many obstacles to the attempts of techniques to spread. To this we should add the disdain for manual labor which pervades all paganism more or less. We should also keep in mind the barbarian invasions which kept Europe in a turmoil for several centuries. We shall thus have no difficulty in understanding the reason for the slow progress of techniques.

On the other hand, one must not underrate the contribution to civilization of Greek art, of Roman law and of Medieval philosophy. It was only an elite which cultivated these sublime values of the spirit, but in the plan of Providence it was necessary to have that base, so that the brutalizing of man might be less easy, when he should be tied down to matter by techniques. However that may be, it is a fact that modern techniques were born in a society saturated with Christian Faith. The religious instruction imparted by the Church in the Universities which it was the first to found, the education of the masses of the people for which it provided maternally in the schools which in the midst of the barbaric age it caused to rise alongside the Cathedrals, the parishes and the monasteries, infused little by little esteem for application to that labor which was called servile, while by the irresistible impulse of the freedom wherewith Christ has endowed us, the last barriers of slavery fell.

God created man in innocence, elevating him to the supernatural state with the infusion of sanctifying grace, and at once assigned him labor as a characteristic of his regal status. With labor he was to take care of the garden in which he had been placed and by means of labor he was to dominate over the fishes, over the land animals and over the birds of the air.

Sin, or the transgression of the law of God, rendered labor tiresome, but did not take from it its dignity. It serves man, precisely because it is connected with pain, as a means of expiating, of purifying himself and of elevating himself to his original greatness, having become an instrument, through the goodness of God, of his rehabilitation and of his powers in favor of his neighbor. Consequently, the Son of God, coming into the world to redeem it, appears in the garb of a workman who applies, in the humble shop of Nazareth, the technique of his time. This could not receive a higher christening!

Workmen were the Apostles, including Paul, who, joining Aquila and Priscilla in Corinth, made cloth for tents.[2]

Animated by this spirit, the early monks, dedicated to the most faithful imitation of the Divine Saviour, united work to prayer, using technical means—which even today cause us wonderment—to drain marshes, to change the course of rivers and to protect the inhabitants against devastating floods.

The Church has stored up the products of techniques, a true enrichment of the human race, carrying them down from age to age, in homage to Christ, in its temples. It is there that we admire, as in a majestic exposition, the techniques in wood and marble working, the techniques in iron and steel craft, the technique of inorganic chemistry, the technique of electromagnetics, all harmonizing in a single hymn to the Creator, who inspires the genius of man.

MODERN LIFE

Nowadays techniques seem to pervade everything; for which reason we speak indeed of "technocracy."

There is no doubt that a good share of the social and economic problems, in civilized countries, are of a nature which is exclusively or partially technical. The building of canals, the control of water courses, electrification, the construction of houses and of roads, hygiene, information services, the intensification of agriculture, the industrialization of natural resources, are hinged upon techniques. More than two-thirds of mankind live to serve techniques. It is time to ask ourselves: is this a good or an evil? Technique, taken in itself, can well be called the meeting of the rational creature with the Creator, who uses the human spirit to continue His work and to impress upon it its final form. It does not violate nature, but helps it. The things which it constructs are always in accord with natural laws and with the ends pre-established by the prime Maker.

Both technical operation and the technical process therefore carry man to a higher level, they train him to sacrifice and accustom him to act not for personal interest, but for the success of a task, which is the translation of a thought, of a well matured idea

[2] *Acts* 18: 3.

into a new reality, directed toward ameliorating the general conditions of life. How can we not admire it and not give way to eulogies?

Those who cling to the past, like polyps to the reef, in an exasperating immobility, can but weep for green gardens, the tranquillity of the mountains, the sweet murmerings of mountain streams, quiet houses, pure air, the transparent sky; and lament that the noise of the machines, the smoke of the chimneys, the swiftness of the means of transportation have made us lose, perhaps forever, the tranquillity and the peace enjoyed by our fathers. These people do not reflect that the pyramids of Egypt, the grandiose constructions of Babylon, of Assyria, of Rome—the greatest manifestations of the productive capacity of ancient civilizations—cost unspeakable fatigues to millions of slaves, working under the sting of cruel goads. Today, instead, innumerable works are built with absolute economy of human sacrifice and at the cost of machines.

It has been demonstrated that, as techniques gradually advance, the daily hours of labor diminish for man and his salary increases. It is likewise true that illiteracy disappears at the same time, because the machine, full of energy, frees children from many manual labors, allowing them time to attend school. In place of drudgery in the fields, in the forests, in fisheries, we have industries, construction, transportation and to these occupations there are continually added ever more numerous professional and administrative activities.

To sum up, in place of slave men, today we have slave machines.

The enormous increase of production which technical progress is destined to create goes on extending to the various categories a great amelioration of the standard of living, and assures, to an ever increasing number of persons, suitable conditions of existence, when they are victims of accidents, weakened by sickness, or tottering with old age.

With technical progress man not only brings under subjection, little by little, the elements of nature, but he prolongs his life itself, protecting it against attacks which up till now were invincible. Pestilence, smallpox, cholera, famine are scourges which have almost disappeared from the face of the earth. Fields fertilized by nitrates and phosphates give increased harvests. Vaccines, preventive or therapeutic injections, the pneumothorax and the iron

lung, the electric shock treatments, radiography, radioscopy, the electrocardiograph, the oscillograph for the nerves and the brain, the antithermics, like aspirin, antipyrin, and pyramidine, the antibiotics like penicillin, streptomycin, chloromycetin and aureomycin, together with other instruments and drugs, which reach unheard of precision, make it possible for surgeons and doctors to be truly healers.

All these benefits, of incalculable value, are indeed conceived by science, but are produced in actuality by techniques.

We should not pass over in silence the potentiality given by techniques to the most noble human senses, which are sight and hearing.

If we can scrutinize the depths of the heavens even to counting the stars of our universe and to observing worlds in formation beyond the galactic system, if we perceive life in its infinitesimal germ and energy in its source in the atom, it is in virtue of technical instruments, and it is these, too, which make us hear, if we will, distant voices and enable us to pass on to our successors our voices.

SNARES AND DANGERS

Nevertheless, against the totality of benefits given by technical progress significant harm can be counterbalanced.

Technical progress, serving industry, and the latter often at the mercy of a pitiless capitalism, makes of millions of workers a formless mass. Men taken from life in the family, buried in dark mines, suffocated in deafening factories, constrained to breathe smoke and dust every day, chained to a uniform and monotonous labor, without personal initiative, deprived of every sense of direct responsibility, wind up by becoming materialized, tiny and anonymous cogs in a great social machine, organized in materialistic fashion. Here is the great danger to which the Holy Father calls the attention of governors and governed. The technique of the machine, *per se* directed toward sound human progress, threatens to become, and becomes in fact in various parts of the world, a basis and a model for a social organization which has for a soul precisely the technical spirit, from which derives—as the Holy Father wisely points out—"a distorted vision of the world . . . and a unilateral suggestion which does not recognize and does

not appreciate as reality anything but what can be expressed in numerical relationships and in utilitarian calculations."

According to Karl Marx technical progress is called upon to suppress human needs and to make men brothers in a common well-being which will be a paradise upon earth.

Marxian socialism, making even worse the enslavement of man caused by liberal capitalism, according to a blind dialectical materialism and an implacable historical determinism, has made of the worker a cog with a number which must mesh with others according to a pre-established plan, called "planning" for production—like a machine manipulated by a mechanic—under the iron direction of a tyrannical hierarchy, culminating in a supreme despotic authority.

It is a fearful tragedy as it works out.

I think that every upright man must see in this system the exploitation of social needs for a utopian end. Pursued in good faith, it is at best uncivilized; otherwise it is in reality anti-christian.

There still remain, unfortunately, in many parts of our country, as in other countries, families without a human habitation, babies abandoned at the side of the street, men out of work, the most noble instrument of subsistence. Here and there are lacking suitable conditions of life. The wisdom of those who are in charge of the government, it is to be hoped, will not delay in making provision for this. Technical progress will give assistance, but to pretend to resolve the social question with mere techniques is to suppress the dignity of the human person, without succeeding in making people contented.

If every man had a house fitted with the greatest comforts, if air conditioning made of the seasons of the year a perennial springtime, if exquisite foods and selected diversions were at the disposition of every individual, the soul, thirsting for truth and avid for what is good, would not cease to make felt its demands, which have in them something of the infinite.

The perfecting of techniques will suppress, if not all, at least the difficulties created by themselves.

Electrical energy, and better yet, tomorrow, atomic energy, will free man from the noises which unnerve him, from the darkness

and the dust which make his breathing difficult. He will leave to regulative or automatic machines the monotonous fatigues of today, to reserve for himself the intelligent direction of the mechanisms.

We repeat, however, that beyond the world of matter, all persons discover within themselves the world of the spirit, which is not the spirit of techniques.

A few years ago I asked Jacques Maritain, on his return from America, where he had given various lectures, what subjects he was accustomed to treat of in the presence of a people which seems to have touched the summits of technical progress. "I spoke," he answered, "of contemplation."

I could not hide my surprise and added, "And Your Excellency was listened to?"

"Most attentively," he told me, "everyone showed an extraordinary interest." Ah, therefore, technical progress does not suffocate the spirit, but from techniques it breaks forth more powerful.

In the unspeakable bitterness of this sad age it may be that because of an instinctive need of the soul dreams are nourished, but may I be allowed to assert here solemnly the confidence that out of the hard experience of a mechanized society there will arise a new spirituality? Ours is the task of accelerating its coming.

SHINING CHARITY

The Holy Father, feeling in his noble soul the echo of the sorrow which afflicts humanity, is continuously trying to temper its harshness.

The Pontifical Work of Assistance, in the highest intent of the Holy Father, corresponds to the "I have compassion on the multitude" which came from the lips of Jesus.

His Holiness has gone out to meet human miseries with his great heart, creating a new work of mercy.

To speak only of Italy, in 1953, in infants' shelters and kindergartens and in their own families, 160,857 babies have been helped. In many centers—with various courses—33,195 adolescents were trained professionally, while 32,055 young men were occupied profitably in apprentice schools.

Summer camps, permanent ones for Sundays, after-school activities, playgrounds, houses of education, helped 763,560 children,

giving them a way to regain their health through play. Tables set with delicate charity in working quarters have provided sound and nourishing food to 502,808 laboring men.

I should take too long should I try to give the list of the social assistance granted by the Sovereign Pontiff through his Work of Assistance. The manual laborers of Apulia and of Lucania, the the shepherds of Sardinia and of Abruzzo, the refugees from Venezia Giulia and from Africa, the emigrants and the poor dispersed in the different regions, those in prison and those freed from prison, have felt the effective presence of the Common Father, who has mobilized, to serve them, more than 100,000 persons. He has hurried, solicitous and charitable, wherever calamity has struck, to Calabria, to the island of Kysko in Japan, to Holland, lands devastated by floods, to the Ionian islands shaken by an earthquake.

This vast field of charitable works was *technically organized.*

SOCIAL SERVICE

Social service has come into use, at least in practice, in many Nations and already possesses a special technique, enabling it to know exactly the individuals, the families and the groups of the needy, in relation to the psychology of each one, their surroundings, the legislation in force and the manifold public and private Institutions for Assistance.

The Schools of Social Service, which, thanks be to God, are being multiplied in our country too (the Pontifical Work of Assistance directs ten), prepare technical personnel for the work of Assistance. How much good these friends of the people are destined to accomplish, we cannot yet measure; but it is certain that very soon every parish, every commune, every establishment, every group of human beings will have to have at least a Social Assistant who will interpret its needs and seek to remedy them, making efforts to bring the indigent, within the limits of the possible, to provide decorously for themselves.

Even beneficence is exposed to the danger mentioned in regard to technical progress, and as this will never succeed in satisfying man to the full, so Social Service cannot restrict itself to external needs. The investigation of the individual case ("case-work")

needs to be complete and exact to go deeply into the intimacies of the spirit.

Today people do not want to hear talk of sin, and yet a great part of the misfortunes, of every kind, derive from guilt or are connected with it.

The seven capital sins are so many sources of numerous evils, of disorders in the family and disorders in society.

How many times we find this truth expressed in the Gospel! In the Mass for today, for example, Jesus had healed the paralytic who was lying beside the probatic pool of Jerusalem, sick for 30 years. On seeing him again shortly afterward He said to him: "Behold thou art made whole: sin no more, lest some worse thing happen to thee."[3]

Daily contact with the poor, with the dispossessed, would have convinced me definitely, if I had had a doubt about it, that the remedy is never sufficiently efficacious if it is not sweetened with love. Now it is an infallible teaching that love for one's neighbor cannot be disjoined from love for God. If one does not love God, one does not have true love for one's neighbor.

LOVE THOSE WHO SUFFER

To understand fully the state of one who suffers it is necessary to love him indeed and to love him it is necessary to esteem him and this requires qualities worth considering. Materialism considers man as a minuscule point at which cosmic evolution has arrived, an insignificant point which does not deserve any particular attention. For the Christian on the other hand, man is a person who transcends, in objective value, all the things which surround him. He is a child of God, redeemed from the slavery of evil, by the blood of the Divine Redeemer. He has an immortal soul and an eternal destiny. Such an evaluation makes man deserving, even on this earth, of the greatest respect. If he is miserable, sick, a derelict, he has not lost his high dignity. Christ, poor and suffering, is in him.

This is so true that the Eternal Judge, on the day of final judgment, identifying Himself with the miserable, will reward him who has aided them and will condemn him who has not given them

[3] *John* 5: 14.

to eat and to drink, who has not given them clothing and a dwelling place, who has not visited them when they were sick or in prison.

This lofty Christian sense must completely inform technical assistance in order that it may be human and adequate.

It is not to be believed that techniques of assistance alone are sufficient to soothe or indeed to take away the pains which make a Calvary of life.

They will not succeed in preventing death, which casts a veil of sadness over all that passes. They will not succeed in putting out the fire of passions which agitate the heart and disturb the mind. They will not succeed in guarding against remorse of conscience when it reproves lack of fidelity to one's duty. Social assistance cannot prescind from the internal world which constitutes the greater and the better part of man.

It is strange but it is nevertheless true. We have an extreme need of God and we do our best to forget him. Often but one word of the Gospel would suffice to give comfort in misfortunes and we try to ignore it. There is prayer, which is the oxygen of the soul, and we try to persuade ourselves that it is an antique left over from bygone ages.

I hope that social assistance will increase, not as an appendage of laicism, but profoundly and openly Christian. Techniques work upon matter and are circumscribed thereby, but the scintilla of intelligence which accompanies them is sufficient to let us see between the lines beyond the limits of matter, the mystery, and the mystery is the basis for a spiritual reconstruction.

PEACE IS WITHIN US

It seems as if technical progress is about to reach its triumph and this nourishes in many the hope that soon, by means of the continual increase in the volume of production and an equitable division of the goods of the earth, human needs will finally be satisfied. It is the goal to which tend the efforts of sociologists and statesmen. Peace should be the fruitful consequence thereof.

The Holy Father notes, with the supreme authority which is His, that peace "is above all an attitude of the spirit."

The blessed Jesus said it first: "Pax intra vos est," "Peace is within you." How, in fact can there be peace among the Nations

and among peoples if the individual citizens do not put a rein upon their desires, which are disorderly, if there is not a voluntary observance of the divine law, which explains and determines the natural law and gives a solid foundation for just human laws? One cannot have peace without enlightened and determined governments, which know how to lead their citizens—with timely and opportune energy—to the amelioration of customs, the impeding of disorders, the protecting of honesty, the promoting of civilized, beneficent institutions, in a continual care for the common welfare.

NECESSARY SOLIDARITY OF CATHOLICS

Paul the Apostle affirms that in the world there seethes the "*mysterium iniquitatis*,"[4] this mystery of impiety and of injustice opposed to the kingdom of God. Unfortunately, the two fronts are not clearly separated. The *mysterium iniquitatis* casts its poisonous tentacles even among those who believe in Christ and vaunt that they adhere to Christian traditions.

The moment through which we pass is grave beyond measure. The enemy is at the gates, and it would be an unpardonable fault to imitate the Byzantines who were discussing fine points of philosophy while all around them everything crumbled. One who sows discord, who sets to work jealousies, ambitions, egoisms, cupidities, dividing the field and extinguishing the necessary ardor, does not belong to the army of the good. It is urgent that we close ranks. May Heaven grant that the Catholics, in Italy, leaving aside political dissensions which are contingent things, will draw together to move compactly against the advancing forces of evil, which are terribly well organized, reaching out to loose the blow which in their boldness they feel would be decisive, to beat down Christian civilization and set up, on the sacred soil of our fatherland, the absolute dominion of a blind technology, which is slavery and barbarism.

May the *Credo*, itself frankly professed and sincerely lived, be the bond which unites us. May the socio-economic doctrine which Popes Leo XIII, Benedict XV, Pius XI, and particularly the reigning Pontiff, have clearly promulgated, be the program to put into practice. Only thus will this earthly exile become less difficult

[4] *II Thess.* 2:7.

and will the gaining of Heaven be easier. Justice will reign and this will produce peace: *Opus iustitiae pax!*

The many miseries which we witness, the babel of ideas, the almost complete disappearance of true ideals, especially in our young people who are disoriented, the moral aberrations, the succession of scandals, the anguishing uncertainties of the future put our courage to a cruel test, painting life with colors which are ever darker. Behold: from the Vatican spreads a light, it is the inextinguishable one of the Martyrs, of the heroes of our holy Religion. It reflects from the obelisk of the Piazza San Pietro, which a thousand winds have not been able to beat down. A motto, which is a battle-cry and a paean of victory, arises, throbs, rings out: *Christus heri, Christus hodie, Ipse et in saecula;* "Christ yesterday, Christ today, Christ forever!"

Forward, yes, forward in Christ and for Christ with the Pope, guided by the Queen of Victories, Mary Immaculate, resolute to risk the darkness with our faith in Christ and to warm hearts with the love of the Gospel, even at the cost of death.

ERNEST CARDINAL RUFFINI

Palermo, Sicily

MARY, EVER-VIRGIN

PART I

This consideration of the perpetual virginity of the Mother of God will include two main points. These are (1) the nature of virginity in general and (2) the truth that Mary in particular is ever-Virgin. With respect to this latter we shall, following Christian tradition, treat separately of Our Lady's virginity (a) before the birth of Christ, (b) at the time of the birth of Christ, and (c) forevermore after the birth of Christ. Lastly we shall discuss any special meaning which may be involved in this threefold aspect of Mary's perpetual virginity.

THE NATURE OF VIRGINITY[1]

Virginity, as is evident from Christian tradition, crystallized in Pope Pius XII's Encyclical on Holy Virginity, means the firm purpose of perpetually abstaining from all sexual pleasures on the part of one who has never experienced such pleasures. It involves three aspects called respectively virginity of the body, of the mind (or of intention) and virginity of the senses.

The first of these which designates bodily integrity means merely that the sexual powers have not voluntarily been used, that is, that in a man there has been no voluntary pollution, in a woman that there has been no voluptuous breaking of the hymen. Here bodily integrity is only a presupposition to true virginity, not the virtue itself.

Virginity of the senses also designates a mere fact, namely immunity from even internal sexual pleasure. Though this is a necessary element in true virginity it does not constitute the perfection of the virtue.

Virginity of intention, that is the firm purpose of perpetually abstaining from sexual pleasures, properly constitutes the virtue. This doctrine is to be found in Our Lord's own teaching, according to Pius XII; for the Pontiff recalls that the virginity praised by the Saviour is "a resolution freely made to abstain all one's life

[1] Cf. *Sum. theol.*, II-II, q. 152. Prümmer, *Manuale theologiae Moralis* (Friburg, 1933), II, 523-26; Merkelbach, *Mariologia* (Paris, 1939), pp. 216-17.

from marriage and sexual pleasure." And he adds that according to Christ "Chastity to be really perfect must be perpetual."

But—the Holy Father makes clear—even virginity of intention has its real moral value and dignity *only* if it is undertaken out of love of divine things. The Pontiff writes "This then is the primary purpose, this is the central idea of Christian virginity: to aim only at the divine, to turn thereto the whole mind and body: to want to please God in everything, to think of Him continually, to consecrate body and soul completely to Him." So true is this that if sexual abstinence be undertaken for only lesser motives it is not the true Christian virtue. Again, in the words of the Holy Father, "Those therefore who do not marry because of exaggerated self-interest, or because . . . they shun the burdens of marriage, or because . . . they proudly flaunt their physical integrity . . . none of these can claim for themselves the honor of Christian virginity."

Virginity therefore implies not a cold rejection of naturally good and pleasant functions, but rather a maximum love of good, a fierce thirst for divine good even at the cost of great sacrifice. This virtue has about it a quasi-heroic nobility. For that reason it ranks even above parenthood; because whereas the latter is, ideally, the ultimate achievement of human love, perfect virginity is an achievement and proof of divine love.

THE VIRGINITY OF OUR LADY

Faith itself teaches us the threefold destination of Mary's virginity which has already been noted. We shall consider in turn each of these three aspects; with respect to each we shall indicate first the fact of Our Blessed Mother's virginity, and secondly the reasons for, or fitness of that aspect of her spotless virtue.

I. *Mary was a virgin* ante partum

This doctrine has been not only rejected by some but contemptuously despised, and the Mother of God consequently represented as degraded and quite immoral. Others have represented her as the mother of Jesus through her husband, Joseph.[2] Yet the fact of Mary's virginity prior to Christ's birth is evident from the teaching of the Church, from the words of Sacred Scripture, and from the weight of Christian tradition.

[2] Cf. Roschini, *Mariologia* (Rome, 1948), pp. 241-45.

A. *From the authority of the Church*

The earliest formulations of the Creed expressly mention the birth or conception of Christ by the *Virgin*. So we read in the Creed "[Jesus Christ] who was born of the Holy Ghost of the *Virgin* Mary";[3] "who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the *Virgin* Mary";[4] "perfectly begotten of Mary *ever Virgin* through the Holy Ghost."[5]

Later the Council of Constantinople added to the Nicene formula the words "he was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost, of the *Virgin* Mary."[6] The formula known as *Fides Damasi* reads "the Son . . . was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of Mary a *Virgin*."[7] In his dogmatic encyclical, Leo the Great taught "The only begotten [Son] was born of the Holy Ghost and the *Virgin* Mary. . . . He was conceived of the Holy Ghost within the womb of a *virgin* mother who as she conceived, *though her virginity was preserved,* so she brought him forth, her virginity being preserved."[8] The General Councils of Chalcedon,[9] II and III Constantinople,[10] IV Lateran,[11] Lyons,[12] and Florence[13] all taught the virginity of Mary. So among the Popes did, in addition to St. Leo, Gregory the Great,[14] Honorius I,[15] Martin I,[16] Adrian I,[17] Leo IX,[18] Innocent III,[19] Sixtus IV[20] and Paul IV.[21] Therefore Mary's virginity is *de fide,* a defined dogma.

B. *From Sacred Scripture*

Both the Old and New Testaments bear important witness to the virginal state of the Mother of the Messias; the old by way of prophecy, the new by way of fulfillment.

The two more important passages of the Old Testament are Psalm 21:10, 11; and Isaias 7:14.

Psalm 21 is Messianic in its proper sense, and looks forward to Christ, especially in His passion, as the proper realization of its content. The verses pertinent to our purpose here read "Thou [Lord] are he that hast drawn me out of the womb: my hope from the breasts of my mother. *I was cast upon Thee from the womb.*

[3] *DB*, 2. [4] *DB*, 6. [5] *DB*, 13. [6] *DB*, 86.
[7] *DB*, 16. [8] *DB*, 144. [9] *DB*, 201, 202.
[10] II Constantinople (*DB*, 214, 218-227); III Constant. (*DB*, 290).
[11] *DB*, 429. [12] *DB*, 462. [13] *DB*, 708 ff. [14] *DB*, 250.
[15] *DB*, 251. [16] *DB*, 255-57. [17] *DB*, 310. [18] *DB*, 344.
[19] *DB*, 422. [20] *DB*, 734-35. [21] *DB*, 993.

From my mother's womb *Thou are my God.*" Express allusion is made here to the ancient custom of placing a new-born child in the lap of his father; the father so acknowledged his child. The Messias is "cast upon" the Eternal Father who thereby acknowledges His Son. This signifies that Mary was virgin in conceiving (*ante partum*) the Christ, by showing that Christ was begotten of Mary by no human father, but by divine power.

Secondly, it is written in Isaias "Behold a virgin shall conceive and bear a son and his name shall be called Emmanuel." With respect to this text authors have proposed difficulties which can be reduced to two principal points: (1) the word *virgin* does not occur in the original Hebrew text, hence the prophecy cannot be cited in favor of Our Lady's virginity, and (2) the text does not refer to the Messias or to his mother, but to other persons, for example to the wife and son of the prophet Isaias, or to the wife and son of the king Achaz to whom the prophecy was spoken, or more indefinitely to some undetermined young woman and her offspring. According to this last opinion all that the prophet intended was to announce that deliverance and salvation for Achaz and his kingdom would be no longer delayed than the time between a young woman's conceiving and bearing a son.

The precise etymological meaning of *almah,* the Hebrew word translated into virgin, is disputed and, at the present time, is perhaps impossible to determine with certainty. Yet it is agreed that it does signify even in its etymology an unmarried young woman—who would, presumptively, be a virgin. Father Lagrange has pointed out that the German *Jungfrau* similarly signifies of itself a young woman but is used to designate a virgin in the strict sense.[22]

The use of *almah* in various forms in other places in the Old Testament sheds more light on its meaning. Thus it designates Rebecca[23] who, a few verses earlier, is declared a virgin in the real sense of that word.[24] It is used too of Mary, the sister of Moses, when she was a young woman, i.e. at the time when the infant Moses was hidden.[25] In Psalm 67 it refers to the young woman who took part in a religious ceremony—by custom these were unmarried young women. The word signifies again maidens

[22] M. J. Lagrange, "La Vierge et Emmanuel" in *Revue Biblique,* I (1892), 481 ff. [23] *Gen.* 24:13. [24] *Gen.* 24:16. [25] *Exod.* 2:8.

in attendance on the queen or who are later to be married[26]—but young women who are virgins for they are expressly distinguished both from queens and concubines of the king. In the same canticle the word is used of unmarried young women who are drawn to love the king.[27] Lastly in the book of Proverbs[28] the word is used probably in reference to a young unmarried woman who despite secret unchastity would remain *de jure* a virgin. In the Scriptures, then, the word *almah* is in every instance used to signify either a virgin in the strict sense or a young woman who is unmarried and at least presumptively a virgin.

It seems clear that St. Matthew—no less a Jew than Isaias—and the Jewish community for which he wrote his Gospel understood Isaias' word *almah* to mean a virgin in the true sense. After describing the virginal manner of Mary's conception (and emphasizing especially St. Joseph's puzzlement) the Evangelist wrote that what had happened to Mary was the fulfillment of Isaias' prophecy.[29] His Jewish contemporaries could not have accepted it as such unless they understood the Hebrew word to refer in a true way to a virgin.

Again the very context of Isaias' words bear this out. The point of the prophecy is twofold. It is *first* a sign, an extraordinary sign fixed by God Himself, as the language of the prophet indicates; that is why the prophecy is introduced by the very solemn and emphatic "Behold." Surely, as Origen argued,[30] there would be no such sign in a married woman's conceiving and bearing a son; few things are more ordinary and natural than that. Secondly, the prophecy is a rebuke not alone to Achaz but to the entire "house of David" to which it was directly addressed; it was the foretelling that salvation would not come from the line of Achaz, that the kingly house was to be excluded from God's working out of the salvation of the people. Paternity of the Saviour was definitively excluded from the kingly family precisely because the Saviour would be conceived with no man's co-operation but by "the virgin." Without that the prophecy lacks the rebuke to Achaz and his house which the whole context supposes.

[26] *Cant.* 6:7. [27] *Cant.* 1:2.

[28] *Prov.* 30:19. Concerning the difficulty of this text cf. Roschini, *op. cit.*, II, 101 f. [29] *Matt.* 1:19-23.

[30] *Contra Celsum*, c. 38 (*MPG*, XI, 728).

We must conclude then, from what is more generally held about the etymology of *almah*, from its use in the Bible generally, from Jewish understanding of its meaning in St. Matthew's time, and from its context in Isaias, that the word designates a young woman, unmarried, and presumptively, or *de jure*, a virgin. It is then roughly equivalent to "virgin." To these reasons the Christian adds the constant tradition of the Church which, in light of the inspired text of St. Matthew, sees Mary's virginal motherhood as the fulfillment of the prophecy and sees the prophecy, therefore, as the foretelling of her virginity even in her maternity. Inspired text renders certain the meaning of inspired text.

The second problem—does the prophecy refer really to Christ and Mary?—is more briefly answered. The Fathers unanimously teach this interpretation of Isaias, and from their unanimous teaching no Christian dares depart since it is a certain rule of exegesis. Negatively it can be shown that any other interpretation is insufficient or arbitrary. To see in Ezechias, the son of Achaz, the fulfillment of the prophecy is unfitting; he was already about nine years of age when Isaias uttered his inspired prediction! Secondly, Isaias' own son seems unlikely as the Emmanuel; it would be purely arbitrary to ascribe to him the qualities delineated by the prophet. Again, in light of Isaias himself, the mother of Isaias' children could in no real sense be called *almah*.[31] Lastly, the interpretation which refers this prediction to an indefinite woman and her child seems opposed to the text of Isaias in which a definite virgin is indicated, for the article precedes *almah*, determining its significance very precisely to one definite virgin. In addition this indefinite interpretation militates against the definite, singular character of the virgin's offspring as foretold in verse 15.

The New Testament teaching on Mary's virginity is most clear. When the Angel Gabriel had announced to Mary that she would conceive and bear the Saviour, Mary answered with the question "How shall this be done, because I know not man?" The angel replied "The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee."[32] Mary by her own protestation was a virgin at the Annunciation—"I know not man." God's plan was that she would conceive virginally, not in the ordinary way, but by a divine and miraculous intervention. It was

[31] Cf. *Isaias* 8:3: "And *I went to the prophetess* and she conceived and bore a son."

[32] *Luke* 1:34, 35.

only with this assurance that Mary gave consent to motherhood. No solid argument against the authenticity of these verses has ever been formulated.

Secondly, we read in the Gospel according to St. Matthew that "When . . . Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost. Whereupon Joseph . . . was minded to put her away. . . . But . . . the angel of the Lord appeared to him . . . saying: . . . that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost."[33] Patently, the inspired evangelist teaches here the virginity of Mary conceiving Christ, for her pregnancy was due exclusively to the Holy Spirit (that is to the divine will) and was in no way result of human intercourse.

Against this has been urged the reading of the ancient Syro-Sinatic version of St. Matthew namely "Jacob begot Joseph, Joseph to whom the virgin Mary was espoused, begot Jesus" as against the ordinary reading "and Jacob begot Joseph the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus who is called Christ."[34]

An obvious answer to this difficulty is that the reading of a *single* codex does not avail against all others. But, in addition, the very text in question asserts in verse 19 and the following the virginity of Mary! Hence the begetting of Jesus by Joseph is meant perhaps in a legal sense, but definitely not in the sense that Joseph was the natural father of Jesus; if the verb were taken in that sense the text would be self-contradictory. In fact the verb *begot,* as used by St. Matthew in this genealogy, does not always mean natural paternity, as for example in verses 8, 11, and 12.

C. *From the Fathers of the Church*

The witness of Christian tradition to the virginity of Mary is so overwhelming that we must either admit that virginity as part of Christian faith or admit that Christianity has from the beginning been in error on this point.

St. Ignatius, disciple of the Apostles, expressly teaches that Mary was a virgin *ante partum* and *in partu*.[35] Aristides, writing about the year 125, says that Christ "begotten of the holy virgin without seed and without corruption, assumed flesh."[36] And

[33] *Matt.* 1:18-20. [34] *Matt.* 1:16.
[35] *Epist. ad Ephes.,* 19 (*MPG,* V, 660).
[36] *Apologia ad Adrianum,* 25 (*MPG,* XCVI, 1121).

St. Justin, who very often refers to Our Lady not by her name but simply as *the Virgin,* wrote "The power of God coming upon the Virgin she was with child."[37] Irenaeus speaks of Christ being from "Mary who was still virgin."[38] Tertullian says that "a virgin conceived and bore Emmanuel."[39] St. Hippolytus puts it "The Word of God . . . took human flesh of the holy Virgin."[40] Clement of Alexandria reads "The Son of God . . . took flesh and was conceived in the womb of the Virgin."[41] Origen expressly says that Christ was "born of the Virgin."[42]

D. *The reasons for Mary's virginity* ante partum[43]

Granted the fact that Mary was indeed Virgin even in the moment of the Incarnation there can remain obscurity as to the reason for this fact. Why had divine Providence arranged that the Word should be enfleshed only in the womb of the Virgin?

To this, as to any question of divine "motives," we can give no adequate answer. Only infinite Wisdom adequately discerns the goodness of what God's will decrees. Yet some rays of the beauty of what God has loved can reach even to our dullness; and so we can, imperfectly but truly, discover some aspects of the beauty, the harmony of what God has willed.

That the Son of God should be born in His humanity of a virgin and without human father is most proper first of all with respect to the divine Trinity itself. Within the Trinity there is only one reality whereby the first divine Person is constituted as really distinct from the other two Persons, and that reality is His Fatherhood of God the Son.[44] For in the Godhead the divine Persons are not mutually distinct from each other in substantial nature as man is distinct from man; no, there is but one God, but one divine nature. Each divine Person is distinct from each other divine Person by a certain relationship. If, therefore, a human person had with respect to Christ the relationship of fatherhood he would be substantially sharing in that which uniquely

[37] *Apologia,* 1, 33 (*MPG,* VI, 380).
[38] *Adv. haereses,* 3, c. 21, n. 10 (*MPG,* VII, 955).
[39] *De carne Christi,* 17 (*MPL,* II, 781).
[40] *De antichristo,* 4 (*MPG,* X, 732).
[41] *Stromata* 6, c. 15 (*MPG,* IX, 352).
[42] *De principiis,* 1 praef. n. 4 (*MPG,* XI, 117).
[43] Cf. *Sum. theol.,* III, q. 28, a. 1. [44] Cf. *ibid.,* I, q. 33, a. 2.

constitutes God the Father in His divine distinctness. If another, and a mere creature, had the power and reality of physical, substantial paternity of the Son, something of the divine uniqueness, the distinctive constitutive of the first Person of the Trinity would be lessened because shared with another. What would be shared would be a natural, physical begetting of that same Person the begetting of whom constitutes the uniqueness of the Father.

Secondly, with respect to the Son Himself, it is most fitting that He should be conceived by a Virgin. This is distinctive of the Word of God within the Trinity, namely that He alone is everlastingly conceived; conceived by the Father according to a spiritual intellectual conception. Such conception implies no loss of perfection whereas carnal conception implies the loss of the perfection of virginity, the physical destruction of the bodily sign of virginity. Most beautifully, then, God's own Son is conceived by His Mother, in time, without destroying any perfection in her but rather by consecrating all that is touched by His Presence. He who is *par excellence* the anointed, the Christ, sanctifies but does not dim what He touches.

With respect again to the man, Christ, His conception by a virgin is most proper. For He came among us, as the Angel announced, in order that He might "save His people from their sins."[45] Now, whosoever is conceived in the normal way is a bearer of sin, a victim of sin, not fittingly the deliverer from sin. Our Blessed Lady, to be sure, was conceived naturally, yet was without any stain of sin—but even she had "the debt of sin." Her preservation from original sin was no right of her own, but a special intervention of God safeguarding her from a corruption to which she should have been subjected. *De jure* ordinary human conception is an instrument for the transmission of spiritual death. Surely He who is in Person the all-holy God and who is in office the absolute Victor over sin should not have been begotten by a process which is now inherently sin-stained.

Lastly, on Mary's part, her virginal conception is the guarantee to her, and to all, that hers is in truth a divine Maternity.

THOMAS U. MULLANEY, O.P.

Dominican House of Studies
Washington, D. C.

[45] *Matt.* 1:21.

A PROPOSED REFORM OF THE CALENDAR[1]

The proposal for a reform of the calendar, made by the Government of India, will be discussed by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations (ECOSOC) during its 18th Session which opens on June 29. On various occasions during the past thirty years plans for a reformed calendar have been discussed by the League of Nations. Very many plans were considered, but only one has survived, that of the World Calendar Association.[2] It is this plan that is being proposed by India. On previous occasions the sponsors of reform have been the Governments of various Christian States. Now, for the first time, the proposal is being made by the Government of a great country with a predominantly non-Christian population. This is a matter of some significance. It shows that the interest in, and desire for, a reform of the calendar is becoming more widespread. One can well understand that India, which suffers from the confusion due to a multiplicity of calendars, should desire to introduce uniformity in this important matter. It is interesting that the Indian Government should favor the World Calendar, which is substantially our Gregorian Calendar, with some modifications.

Our Calendar, as far as the length of the year and the division into months is concerned, is, indeed, neither Gregorian nor Christian in origin. The length of the months remain today exactly as they were fixed by Julius Caesar, except that Augustus is said to have taken one day from February to add to the month which he named after himself. The names of the months have remained unchanged since the time of Julius Caesar, except that, after his time, Quinctilis and Sextilis became July and August respectively. In early Roman times March was the first month of the year, but already before Julius Caesar the Roman year began on January 1.

Caesar introduced a leap year every fourth year, in order to adjust the length of the calendar year to that of the solar year. This

[1] Official translation of the article originally published in *L'Osservatore Romano*, June 28, 1954.

[2] It is not without interest to recall that this plan was devised by a Catholic priest, Abate Marco Mastrofini. The book in which he described it was published in Rome in 1834.

adjustment was not exact. By the sixteenth century the calendar year was several days ahead of the solar year. Pope Gregory XIII set up a commission to study the matter and to devise a way to correct this error. At the same time he founded the Specola Vaticana, so that astronomical observations might be made to demonstrate the need for a reform of the calendar. Pope Gregory, in his Calendar Reform Bull of 1582, decreed that ten days should be dropped in that year, in order that the Spring equinox should be brought back to March 21. He prescribed a new Leap Year rule, which is so exact that the calendar year will keep closely in step with the solar year for thousands of years to come. The Bull also decreed new rules for computing the date of Easter, based on fresh calculations of the relation between the lunar month and the solar year.

There have been some attempts to improve on the Gregorian leap year rule, so as to make the adjustment of the calendar year to the solar year more exact. For all practical purposes such alterations are totally unnecessary. They suffer, moreover, from a serious defect, in that they lack the simplicity which is such a great advantage of the Gregorian rule. In fact, the framers of the new "World Calendar," recognising the excellence of the Gregorian rule, leave it quite unchanged.

The new scheme proposes: (1) to adjust the lengths of the months so that the year shall consist of four equal quarters, and (2) to count the last day of the year—and, in leap years, the day after June 30—as extra days not belonging to any week or month. It follows that any particular date would be on the same day of the week each year.

It is not quite correct, if we wish to be precise, to call the proposed reform "a reform of the Gregorian Calendar." What would be altered are not the changes made by Pope Gregory but the length of the months which we have inherited from pagan Rome, and the sequence of the weeks, which will be altered by the introduction of intercalary days. This distinction is, however, quite commonly ignored. Many of those who advocate the change speak of the defects and inconveniences of the "Gregorian Calendar" (for example, the unequal quarters) as if they were the result of Pope Gregory's work. A recent example of this attitude occurs in

an article in a widely-read periodical by an Indian writer, Dr. H. A. Ali, of the University of Hyderabad. Dr. Ali writes:

> The answer to the question as to how the Christian year began to commence with the first of January is very simple. Nearly 1600 years after Christ, came the vicegerent of God on earth, known as Pope Gregory XIII. He was a very powerful Pope and he wanted the new year rejoicings to be close to the date on which the nativity of Christ was celebrated. Since the birth of Christ on December 25th is not an established fact, he would have been wiser to have brought the Nativity celebrations closer to the vernal equinox. But the Spring festival was a pagan custom and Christmas had already become associated with snow and hearth-fires. So instead of changing the official birthday of Christ, the New Year was shifted from March, the time when all Nature rejoices, to January, a period when Nature is asleep. And Europe quietly obeyed the Pope in 1582, when the Renaissance had been preaching its gospel of intelligence and freedom for 200 years![3]

It is perhaps sufficient comment on this remarkable distortion of history to remind the reader of the fact that from before the time of Julius Caesar, who flourished more than 1600 years before Pope Gregory, the year began on January 1. It is true that in the Middle Ages in various parts of Europe a custom grew up of dating the year "from the Incarnation" (March 25) or "from the Nativity of Our Lord" (December 25). However, before the time of the Gregorian Reform, January 1 had again become, in most of Europe, the beginning of the year.

We can of course excuse an Oriental writer for not being familiar with the history of Western civilization. Others, however, who might be expected to know better, write in similar terms, and it is time that the matter should be made clear.

With regard to the attitude of the Catholic Church towards proposals for a reform of the calendar, there are some who think that the Church must necessarily be opposed to all attempt at change. This belief is, in fact, not correct. I think it is true to say that the Church has no reason to oppose in principle a modification of the present calendar. If there were a general desire for reform, motivated by serious requirements of the economic and social life of the peoples of the world, the Catholic Church would not fail

[3] *Journal of Calendar Reform,* April, 1954, p. 24.

to consider the question, provided, naturally, that certain conditions, which she herself cannot overlook, are observed.

Closely connected with calendar reform is the question of fixing the date of Easter. The sponsors of the World Calendar Plan state explicitly that they do not attempt to deal with the Easter question. They realize fully that that is a matter which pertains to the ecclesiastical authorities. However, it cannot be denied that the desire for a fixed date for Easter is becoming more widely felt. In the early centuries of the Church there were long and often very bitter conflicts over the date of Easter, until a solution was reached in the Council of Nicea (325 A.D.) Hence, it is, indeed, a very venerable tradition that places Easter on the first Sunday after the full moon after the vernal equinox. The Church, however, which made that rule would also, undoubtedly, have the power to alter it, if there were grave reasons which would make such a change advisable.

DANIEL J. K. O'CONNELL, S.J.

The Vatican Observatory
Vatican City

ST. PIUS X ON THE NATIONAL SHRINE

It is most desirable, therefore, that all Catholics should promptly and generously contribute towards the happy completion of this Church, which so many praiseworthy Catholic women have undertaken. In this way there will arise a masterpiece of religious architecture which will lift heavenward the mind of every student that enters it, will make him thirst for wisdom from above, will fill his heart with that wisdom, and will preserve it religiously while he lives.

May these holy prayers be heard through the Immaculate Mother of God, in whose honor it has been decided to build this Church. May her motherly eyes watch day and night over The Catholic University at Washington.

—St. Pius X, in the letter addressed to Cardinal Gibbons and dated July 8, 1914.

ARE THERE "LESS ENCOURAGING" PAPAL PRONOUNCEMENTS?

In his "Review of Theology" presented in *Thought*, Spring issue, 1954, Fr. Elmer O'Brien, S.J., makes the following comment on *Catholic Ecumenism*, a doctoral dissertation from The Catholic University of America, by Fr. Edward Hanahoe, S.A.:

> It is all too easy for Catholics, in reading such works as these [certain Protestant works on Ecumenism] to explode with impatience in several different directions at once. This, I fear, Father Hanahoe frequently does in his volume, a sort of anthology of the less encouraging papal pronouncements on the subject for which we must all be grateful.[1]

The statement that Father Hanahoe frequently explodes with impatience in the course of his dissertion can be challenged. The work is objective, free from what could justly be characterized as "frequent explosions of impatience." Moreover, the designation of *Catholic Ecumenism* as an "anthology of papal pronouncements" is hardly an accurate description of the work. When we speak of an anthology we generally mean a work that is practically entirely made up of quotations. Now, the greater part of Father Hanahoe's work is made up of his own comments and conclusions. It is true, of course, since a doctoral dissertation is a work of research, that the quotations from papal pronouncements pertinent to his theme constitute the most important part of his study and furnish the basis of his own findings; but they surely do not make up the major portion of the book's content.

However, another phrase used by Father O'Brien in his brief notice of this work calls for a more extended comment because of its serious implications, and because it refers not to Father Hanahoe's own statements but to the pronouncements of those who have occupied the chair of Peter in the course of the past century. The phrase in question is "less encouraging papal pronouncements." Father O'Brien does not explain this phrase more fully, but the significance of the words cannot be doubted. The papal pronouncements to which he refers are those issued by the Popes (or by the Holy Office by papal direction) from Pius IX to Pius XII inclusive. They are concerned with movements toward

[1] *Thought*, XXIX, n. 112 (Spring, 1954), 133.

uniting in one body all those who profess to be Christians, for this is the objective of "Ecumenism." The theme which is constantly and consistently repeated in these pronouncements is that there is only one true Church, and that the only way in which Christians are to be united, according to the will of God, is through the unqualified acceptance by all Christians of the teaching and ruling authority of that Church, the Catholic Church. Thus, Pope Leo XIII asserted: "The Church of Christ, therefore, is one and the same forever; those who leave it depart from the will and command of Christ the Lord; leaving the path of salvation they enter on that of perdition."[2] Pope Pius XII expressed the same truth in these words:

> If the Church is inflexible before all that could have even the appearance of compromise, or of an adjustment of the Catholic faith with other confessions, or of its mixture and confusion with them, it is because she knows that there has always been and always will be one sole infallible and sure rock of the whole truth and of the fulness of grace come to her from Christ, and that this rock, according to the explicit will of the Divine Founder, is herself and simply herself.[3]

It is this oft-repeated message of the Popes that is called "less encouraging." It is surely not "less encouraging" to Catholics, but rather encouraging and heartening, since it confirms them in the conviction that they are members of the one true Church of Jesus Christ, the organization divinely established as the necessary means to eternal salvation. Consequently, the pronouncements must be "less encouraging" to non-Catholics. The papal declarations on "Ecumenism" cannot be called "less encouraging" in the sense that they are harsh and vituperative. On the contrary, the spirit of Christian charity, of sincere love for the souls of those separated from Catholic unity is repeatedly manifested. Pope Pius IX, when urging separated Christians to return quickly to the one fold of Christ, declared that like a good shepherd he must "love with a paternal love and embrace in our charity all men."[4] Pope Pius XII asserted that it was "from a heart overflowing with love" that he asked all non-Catholics to "withdraw from that state in

[2] *Satis cognitum, Allocutiones Leonis XIII,* VI, 173.

[3] *L'Osservatore Romano,* Nov. 9, 1948.

[4] *Jam vos omnes,* tr. Lewis in *The Year of Preparation for the Vatican Council* (London, 1869), p. 56.

which they cannot be sure of their salvation."[5] The decree of the Holy Office *De motione oecumenica* states that the Church embraces "with a truly maternal affection" those who return to her bosom.[6]

It would seem to follow, therefore, that the "less encouraging" feature of the papal pronouncements is the fact that they propose without compromise the doctrine that the only way to ecclesiastical unity is to be found in the complete acceptance of the Church's teachings and entire submission to her jurisdiction.

Now, it is true, for a non-Catholic to abandon his religious affiliations and join the Catholic Church frequently demands great sacrifice. But can an exhortation to make this sacrifice be called "less encouraging" when it opens the way to eternal happiness? Our Blessed Lord proclaimed obligations hard to human nature when He said: "He who does not believe shall be condemned"[7] and "If anyone wishes to come after me, let him deny himself and take up his cross and follow me."[8] Yet, it would be incongruous to declare such statements of Our Divine Saviour "less encouraging." Why, then, should we apply this expression to the Church's proclamation that all are bound to seek affiliation with her, inasmuch as she is merely repeating the teaching of Christ Himself? In the words of Pope Leo XIII:

> If those about to come back to their most loving Mother (not yet fully known or culpably abandoned) should perceive that their return involves, not indeed the shedding of their blood (at what price nevertheless the Church was bought by Jesus Christ) but some lesser trouble and labor, let them clearly understand that this burden has been laid on them, not by the will of man but by the will and command of God.[9]

Moreover, where are we to seek "more encouraging" papal statements—statements that mitigate the doctrines of the necessity of the Church for salvation and the obligation of all men to be Catholics? Surely, there have been no Popes who have given a more lenient interpretation of these doctrines than those quoted by Father Hanahoe, since the doctrines in question are portions of the deposit of divine revelation. Of course, the Popes do not

[5] *Mystici corporis, AAS,* XXXV (1943), 243.
[6] *AAS,* XLII (1950), 142. [7] *Mark* 16:16. [8] *Matt.* 16:24.
[9] *Satis cognitum, Allocutiones Leonis XIII,* VI, 156.

repeat these doctrines whenever they address non-Catholics. For example, Pope Pius XII in his Christmas message of 1948 invited non-Catholics to join their efforts toward the procuring of peace,[10] and said nothing about their obligation to return to the Catholic Church. But surely, this fact does not imply any change in regard to the "less encouraging" doctrines. The occasion did not call for the repetition of these teachings, which have been sufficiently proposed by the Popes when they were discussing "Ecumenism."

It is to be feared that there are some Catholics who shun the "less encouraging" approach to non-Catholics, who in their endeavor to win favor of persons of other religious beliefs, or perhaps even to lead them into the Church, gloss over or keep back the doctrines that the Popes have so emphatically proclaimed in their statements on Christian unity. These Catholics are inclined to stress the points of identity between Catholic belief and other creeds, and to underestimate the points of difference. That such a tendency has been manifested in recent times by some Catholics is evident from the detailed rules laid down in the Instruction of the Holy Office regarding the "Ecumenical Movement" given on Dec. 20, 1949:

> [The Bishops] shall be vigilant lest, through a false pretext that those things should be stressed whereby we are united rather than those whereby we are separated, a dangerous indifferentism be fostered. . . . They shall also ward off that dangerous manner of speaking, by which false opinions and vain hopes which can never be fulfilled are begotten—for example, by saying that those statements that are made in the Encyclical Letters of the Roman Pontiffs in regard to the return of the separated to the Church, the constitution of the Church, the Mystical Body of Christ, are not to be so greatly esteemed. . . . Therefore, the *whole* Catholic doctrine is to be proposed and expounded; by no means is that to be passed over in silence or concealed in ambiguous words which Catholic truth comprises regarding the true nature of justification and the way to it, the constitution of the Church, the primacy of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, and of the only true union by the return of the separated to the one true Church of Christ.[11]

Priests especially should take to heart these admonitions of the Holy See in giving instructions, both to Catholics and non-Catholics. Of course, there can be occasions when explanation of the

[10] *AAS*, XLI (1949), 14.

[11] *AAS*, XLII (1950), 144.

Church's attitude toward "Ecumenism" is not called for, and might even be inopportune. Thus, if a Protestant sincerely convinced that his religious belief is correct is approaching the end of life, and a priest realizes that arguments for the divinity of the Catholic Church would not be understood or appreciated, he could abstain from such an explanation and induce the dying man to make the essential acts of faith and contrition. But such occasions must be regarded as exceptional and very rare. Ordinarily the priest who essays to explain the doctrines of the Catholic religion should explicitly include the truths of the necessity and the unity of the Church and the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.

The fact that some non-Catholics will manifest surprise or even resentment on hearing these doctrines should not deter the priest from expounding them when the occasion calls for it. From letters and articles that sometimes appear in magazines nowadays it would seem that there are some non-Catholics in our land who believe that when a Catholic asserts that the Catholic Church alone is the true Church of Jesus Christ he is expressing a personal opinion rather than the common belief of Catholics. Is it possible that this attitude has arisen from the fact that many Catholics are hesitant to bring out this doctrine in their religious discussions with those of other beliefs?

A recent statement by a prominent member of the hierarchy of the United States deserves mention in this connection because of the clear and unequivocal way in which it presents the doctrine on Catholic Unity. I am referring to the pastoral letter which His Eminence, Cardinal Stritch, sent to the clergy and laity of the Archdiocese of Chicago on June 29, 1954. While pointing out that Catholics will gladly co-operate with all their fellow Americans to promote the civil and social welfare of our country and to eliminate evils opposed to our spirit of democracy, the Cardinal emphatically states that the Catholic Church cannot regard itself as in the same situation as other religious bodies:

> The Catholic Church does not take part in these organizations or in their assemblies or conferences. She does not enter into any organization in which the delegates of many sects sit down in council or conference to discuss the nature of the Church of Christ or the nature of her unity, or to propose to discuss how to bring about the unity of Christendom. She does not allow her children to engage in any activity of conference

or discussion based on the false assumption that Roman Catholics, too, are searching for the truth of Christ. For to do so would be to admit that she is but one of the many forms in which the true Church of Christ may or may not exist, that she does not preserve in herself the unity of faith, government and worship willed by our Lord for His Church, that she does not know the true meaning and nature of that unity and of those other God-given properties by which she is distinguished, not only as the one but as the holy, Catholic, and apostolic Church founded by Our Blessed Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Such an admission she can never make, for she is now, as she has always been, the one and only Spouse of Christ, the one and only Mystical Body of Christ, the one and only Church of Christ.[12]

In fulfilling His task as Teacher, Our Blessed Lord was concerned primarily with imparting truth without ambiguity or obscurity. Even when men complained that His words were a "hard saying" He did not resort to equivocation or compromise of His message. This same spirit has characterized the Church down through the centuries; and it should be characteristic of priests, who are privileged to communicate the truths of divine revelation to their fellow men. If to some of our hearers the doctrines of the necessity of the Church for salvation and of the unity of the Church seem hard sayings, we must be willing to bear their blame and resentment as the portion of those who have been deputed by the Church to fulfill the command of her Founder: "Go, therefore, and make disciples of all nations . . . teaching them to observe *all* that I have commanded you."[13]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[12] N.C.W.C. news release. July 8, 1954.
[13] *Matt.* 28 : 20.

THE INTERNATIONAL MARIAN ACADEMY

As the Marian Year enters its final phase, we are all becoming increasingly aware of the fact that we are truly living in an age of Mary. Among the more important signs of growing contemporary devotion to Our Lady there must be listed the foundation of Mariological Societies in many countries, the erection of chairs of Marian theology in many Catholic Universities and Institutes, and the establishment of periodicals devoted to theological studies about Mary.

Because of these comparatively new developments, it became obvious some time ago that there would have to be some international center to organize and unify all of the scholarly activity being expended around the world on theological studies about Our Lady. In 1948 such a center was brought into being. It is the Academia Mariana Internationalis, with headquarters in Rome, at Via Merulana 124.

The immediate purpose of this organization is to promote the development of that section of sacred theology which deals with Our Lady, and to organize international Marian and Mariological congresses. The Mariological congress, incidentally, is one devoted to theological investigation. The Marian congress, on the other hand, concentrates on the fostering and the manifestation of devotion to Mary.

Under the leadership of its distinguished president, Father Carlo Balic, O.F.M., the Academy has produced and is developing six different collections of source material about Our Lady. These collections are the *Bibliotheca Mariana Medii Aevi*, the *Bibliotheca Assumptionis*, the *Bibliotheca Immaculatae Conceptionis*, the *Studia Mariana*, the *Bibliotheca Mariana Moderni Aevi*, and the *Bibliotheca Mediationis*. These collections constitute an asset of immense value for modern research into the problems of Mariology.

Four years ago the Holy Father entrusted the International Marian Academy with the organization and the direction of the never-to-be-forgotten Mariological and Marian congresses that were held in Rome during the last week of October, 1950. For the Mariological congress over three hundred theologians gathered in the Lateran University building to read and discuss schol-

arly papers. For the Marian congress, thousands of Holy Year pilgrims joined with throngs of Romans in magnificent demonstration of devotion to the Mother of God. These two congresses were the prelude to the solemn definition of the dogma of Our Lady's bodily Assumption into heaven, a definition proclaimed by Pope Pius XII in St. Peter's Square in Rome on Nov. 1, 1950.

This year, by the command of the Holy Father, the International Marian Academy will organize and direct the Second Mariological Congress and the Ninth Marian Congress, which will be held in Rome during the last week of October. The combined congresses this year, as in 1950, will be climaxed by an extraordinary act of the Sovereign Pontiff. On Nov. 1 of this year the Holy Father will crown an image of the Blessed Virgin as Queen of the Universe, and will proclaim the establishment of a new feast of the Queenship of the Blessed Mother.

Incidentally, it is interesting to note that, among all the nations which took part in the 1950 Mariological Congress, only the Americans centered their studies around the concept of Our Lady's Queenship.

The 1954 gathering will be known as the Second Mariological Congress and the Ninth Marian Congress. The Mariological Congress of 1950 was the first of its kind in the history of the Church. There had been international Marian congresses, however, since 199, of which the first one was held in Lyons in France. This early series was interrupted in 1912, and the Holy Year Marian Congress was considered as the continuation of that series.

The Catholic press will have a great deal to say about the International Marian Academy during the course of the next few weeks. It is well for us to know what it is, what work it has been called upon to do, and how it proceeds.

ALBAN A. MAGUIRE, O.F.M.

Holy Name College
Washington, D. C.

THE AMERICAN PRIEST DISCOVERS AMERICAN HISTORY

Despite the fact that the Plenary Councils of Baltimore have insisted that the history of the country must be taught in our schools there are still occasional seminaries in the country in which American history is not taught. Probably the basic reason for this neglect is a prejudice sometimes expressed by scholastic philosophers against history: it cannot be rationalized. Arguments are sometimes offered to show that all the worthwhile knowledge taught in history or found in historical narratives can be parcelled out into the other fields of knowledge. Thus political history, economic history, social history, the history of dogma, and the history of philosophy can be justified, but history as such would have no justification because one could not draw therefrom any valid generalization or useful principle. Even such a careful historian as Fr. Gilbert Garraghan in his *Guide to Historical Method* felt the power of this charge sufficiently to imply that there can be generalizations in history in a limited sense. As a matter of fact if history had to justify itself as philosophical knowledge there would be little hope for it. And the philosophers' demand that the Catholic student find such eternally valid generalizations in his American history, if admitted as a just demand, would place the Catholic in American history in an irretrievably bad situation. The trained historian simply answers that such a demand for generalization is based upon an ignorance not only of American history but of other history as well.

In the first place a distinction must be made between history in general and the special history which even the philosophers we spoke about would recognize as valid. In the theological course all seminaries have a course of special Church history in which the work of the Church in carrying out her divine mission is studied and related. So also there can be almost as many other special histories as there are fields of research and study. But history in the ordinary use of the term is the study of all human activities, although historians usually have to set limits as to time and localities to their study because the world-wide extent of human activities makes simultaneous study of the whole physically impossible.

Nevertheless, in this connection the observation of the late Dr. Patrick Healey, that real history dates from the Christian teaching of the call of all men to salvation, has a special validity. The historian may and must limit his study to a part of the world and to a limited period of time and use a definite perspective within those limits, but the raw material of his study remains all human activity. Granting that the observer must be some distance in time and place from his subject for perspective, it can nevertheless be validly argued that the best and truest history possible for the American is American history, because the possibilities of accurate and complete knowledge are so much greater. This may seem heresy to those who have been taught those grand generalizations about the ideal mediaeval world. I recall a sermon in which the preacher compared the mediaeval world to a perfectly constructed mediaeval cathedral with everything in perfect balance and perfect order. Aside from the fact that the great cathedrals were built over several centuries and bear obvious evidences of different times and different concepts, the supposition that the mediaeval world was so perfect is quite unhistorical (and if one raises the question about the effects of original sin, untheological). One does not have to read G. G. Coulton to know that there were bad men, bad philosophers, and bad rulers in the mediaeval period. As one mediaevalist pointed out to me, the decree on the annual Communion was enacted in the Middle Ages, and for a purpose.

To make fun of the philosopher in history is quite easy, but that must not cause us to reject all generalization. Generalization is valid in history if, as Orestes Brownson once pointed out, the generalization is found in the facts of the past and not imposed from without. Very few generalizations covering centuries are valid in details. The old saw that distant pastures look greener is not the only criticism that can be applied to these sweeping generalizations about the history of the Western world. Distance in time, however, does give perspective; and looking over the several centuries after the fall of Rome we can see how certain Western institutions have risen and fallen, how economic and social evolutions have changed the lives of whole nations. But we are also approaching a time when perspective allows generalizations about American history. Historians are not agreed as to when the ancient world yielded to the mediaeval, or the mediaeval to the

modern. The scientific revolution once attributed to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries has been traced back to the early Middle Ages. Elements of the Renaissance of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries have been found in the twelfth century. It is true that accelerations in these trends have given rise to the notion of revolutions at particular times. Likewise the bringing together of economic and social factors with the traditional religious and political factors changed our notions of some of the events formerly treated as purely political or religious. Since, therefore, we recognize this kind of thought and study about Western Europe the question naturally arises whether it can also be applied to our own American history. If we cannot interpret American history in some similar fashion from a study of the facts then American history would be, as some philosophers would have us believe, just a catalogue of facts which one learns by rote. History is fact but facts are never isolated, certainly not in American history. The failure to see historical facts in perspective is the basic cause of our Catholic philosophers' hypercritical attitude towards American history.

There are two notable aspects of this failure of Catholics to enter more seriously into the study of American history. The first is the use of philosophical instead of historical techniques in the study of the past. This is the evident cause for many of the idealistic but historically inaccurate portrayals of mediaeval Europe. The sweeping generalizations about mediaeval universities and mediaeval social, and economic life are not borne out by the facts. Certainly such philosophical tools applied to the real American world where the facts are so readily at hand will not work, and tend to make the user of them ridiculous. The second aspect is the definite failure of Catholics to study the facts of American history to find in them valid generalizations such as would support an opinion like that of Orestes Brownson, that the perfection of the American Republic will be found in the acceptance by the American people of teaching and guidance of the Catholic Church. In both of these improper attitudes towards American history the Catholic has failed to come to grips with the problem of an American civilization, which is a definite reality and which has been pictured by some as definitely opposed to Catholicism. Indeed, it can be said that many of the current efforts to create studies in

American civilization, taking advantage of the absence of Catholics from the field, have as their philosophy a pragmatism that would defeat attempts to bring the American people into the Church. The result of such studies tends to be the creation of an isolated American culture centered in a vaguely Protestant democratic faith in a modern industrialized society.

A Catholic reading the available literature on American history soon becomes aware that almost all the American historians treat Catholicism as something outside the dominant cultural tradition of the country. No reputable historian would try to defend the physical persecution of the Church in colonial times, or in the rough days of the Nativists and Know-Nothings before the Civil War, or the activities of the A.P.A. and Ku Klux Klan against Catholics. But there is an occasionally expressed, and usually implied, theme in standard histories of the United States that the Catholics brought down this persecution on themselves by failing to accept the common cultural tradition. Also, few American historians have felt the need to trace the origins of American cultural traditions back across the ocean to pre-Reformation Europe. A current writer on American political theory—whose book has been praised by some Catholics—uses the word "Puritan" continually throughout his volume without ever coming to a correct historical appreciation of the negative meaning of the term. Other historians seem to take as granted that the so-called Anglo-Saxon democratic tradition which we have accepted from England is as Protestant as the official histories of England try to make it. There has been a tendency, further, to glorify the deistic and materialistic errors of some of the "founding fathers" as if their political insistence on natural rights made holy and correct all their other ideas and habits. As a result, by overlooking the actual circumstances that have created, modified, and sometimes even abolished American institutions, the concept of American political, social, economic and religious ideals is being discussed in terms of a pragmatic, nearly materialistic, philosophy. The only Catholic answer to these generalizations has been an appeal to ideal mediaeval theory. Neither approach is historically sound.

The history of the United States certainly includes the basic dates, names of presidents, battles, political campaigns and economic crises which were for many decades palmed off as the his-

tory of the United States; but this history also includes the transfer of cultural heritage of Western Europe and the economic and social modifications of that heritage resulting from man's migration into a new rich continent.

Since the days of Frederick Jackson Turner American writers have been trying to explain what is American democracy and what is this new man called the American. There have been several theories advanced to explain the good and the bad qualities of American civilization. The Turner notion that American individualism is a creation of life on a primitive frontier has not stood the test of a critical examination of the records of the pioneers, some of whom were good and others bad. Some were religious and others seemed to have lost their religious faith. Some pioneers were democratic, others tried to enslave their neighbors. So also the examination of American political history finds in some of the founders of American government men who consciously imitated European and even ancient Greek and Roman institutions, and in others men who knew little of ancient ideals and who cared less.

In English America, the Carrolls, the Brooks and the Brents lived their Catholic lives among thousands who had no real knowledge of Catholic thought or principles. They found in the new country nothing to weaken or destroy their faith. So also the early German Catholic settlers in Pennsylvania, the Irish in early Charleston and Norfolk and later in Boston and New York came into a country dominantly Protestant, yet in their minds they came into a new world wherein liberty promised a better and happier life without sacrifice of their religious faith. Later Catholic Germans, Poles, Italians, Hungarians and other Slavs entered into the same new world with the same hopes of happiness and progress.

Today the American Catholic minority faces the same problems of seeking economic and social well-being in a less new world, but having become more numerous and more prosperous this minority faces a more pressing burden of self-justification. Finely spun themes about Jefferson and Madison copying Bellarmine's or Suarez's political theories may make pleasant reading but they are not sound historical explanations of the freedom that has been the chief feature of American history. John Locke was a more apparent source. Likewise, American capitalism is an historical reality and the mineral and agricultural richness of the new world

has had much to do with the success of some and the failure of others. But in all this, the principles of Christian living have been the fundamental ideas governing the progress and civilization of the country, and the efforts of some to secularize American civilization constitutes an attempt at national apostasy, not only from Christianity but from American civilization.

To explain American progress and failures by sweeping generalizations is very easy—both for the economic interpretations and for Christian idealists. To do so by historical proof requires hard work. Two world wars and a depression have shaken the assurance of the purely economic interpretation of American growth but as yet the absence of qualified historians trained in sound religious and philosophic principles has prevented a counterbalancing Christian explanation of American growth.

America is the center of the stage in the present crisis. Everything Americans do is the subject of scrutiny and criticism. American material wealth and know-how are being carried into distant countries and to downtrodden people, but have not always been welcomed. American liberty is, indeed, a treasure and American progress has been phenomenal, but is that all there is to America? It is time that we became aware of the spiritual history of American greatness. Freedom is essentially spiritual and those who would find only material advance in American progress are not the true interpreters of the American tradition. To offset these materialistic explanations Christians must begin to produce a true interpretation of the dignity of the Colossus of the New World, of this new man. The challenge is very great. Yet so far the Christian answer has been hesitant and weak; among Catholics it has been almost inaudible. In this crisis over Communism there are signs that Catholics have discovered the Christian tradition of the United States. But there is little evidence of conviction or of a determination to make that conviction the known mark of the American citizen. Probably the cleric has at last discovered American history. It is time that he study it with the aid of his theological and philosophical learning. Then, perhaps, he can write and teach a true interpretation of American civilization.

THOMAS T. McAVOY, C.S.C.

University of Notre Dame
Notre Dame, Ind.

THE PAPAL ALLOCUTION *SI DILIGIS*

On May 31 of this year the Holy Father delivered an allocution to the Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops who were present in Rome for the canonization of St. Pius X. This address must be classed among the more important doctrinal pronouncements of Pope Pius XII, and, indeed, among the more important doctrinal declarations of modern times. It is urgently important that all our priests should take serious cognizance of the lesson the Holy Father drove home so sharply in that document.

The May 31 allocution, which is known as the *Si diligis*, does not, properly speaking, contain any new pontifical decisions at all. It does not set out to resolve any questions which Catholic theologians were hitherto free to debate among themselves. What it really acomplishes is a much more explicit and forceful presentation of a truth which, while previously recognized as certain Catholic doctrine, had never before been set forth so clearly and vividly in an official document of the *ecclesia docens*. It contains a badly needed lesson or, shall we say, a sharp reminder, about the sacred teaching work within the true Church.

Both by reason of the occasion which brought it into being and by reason of its form, the *Si diligis* bears a close resemblance to the allocution *Singulari quadam*, an address delivered by Pope Pius IX on Dec. 9, 1854. Both of these allocutions were delivered to Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops of the Catholic Church who were gathered in Rome for an especially solemn occasion. One hundred years ago that occasion was the definition of the dogma of Our Lady's Immaculate Conception. The *Singulari quadam* was delivered the day after that dogma was defined. This year the occasion was the canonization of St. Pius X, the Sovereign Pontiff who was outstanding in his labors for the purity and the integrity of the Catholic faith. Pope Pius XII pronounced the allocution *Si diligis* two days after the ceremonies of the canonization.

It is interesting to note, incidentally, that Pope Pius XII has delivered one allocution which, from the point of view of the circumstances which called it into being, was much more closely parallel with the *Singulari quadam* than is the *Si diligis*. On Nov. 1, 1950, the Holy Father solemnly defined the dogma of Our Lady's

bodily Assumption into heaven. The following day he addressed an allocution to the Cardinals, Archbishops, and Bishops who were in Rome to be with him for that solemn definition. The allocution of Nov. 2, 1950, however, had to do more with statements about the condition of the Church and with questions of ecclesiastical discipline than with matters of doctrine.[1] Neither in form nor in content did it closely resemble either the *Singulari quadam* or the *Si diligis*.

Both the 1954 allocution and the one issued a century ago were designed to inform the Bishops about current erroneous teachings and to encourage them to act against these false doctrines. Thus Pope Pius IX declared that "Since We, from this citadel of religion, see the forms of error which are being spread abroad throughout the Catholic world during this most difficult period, it has seemed most opportune to point them out to you so that you, Venerable Brothers, who are set up as the guards and the watchmen of the house of Israel may use your strength to work against them."[2] Pope Pius XII indicates his basic purpose in a similar passage.

> Care of all the Church, and the daily vigilance which Our supreme office demands of Us, compel Us to consider and weigh certain ideas, sentiments, and ways of acting. We draw your attention to them, and ask you to unite your vigilant care with Ours, in order thus to provide more quickly and effectively for the needs of Christ's flock. It seems that we are dealing with the symptoms and the effects of a kind of spiritual contagion which require your pastoral care to prevent them from being strengthened and from beginning to spread and to see to it that they are remedied in time and removed as soon as possible.[3]

---

[1] This 1950 allocution consisted of three parts. The first, the introductory section, contains the Holy Father's expression of gratitude to those who are present, his words about the Church in those lands where it is subject to persecution, and his repudiation of the Communist-inspired calumny that he was working to promote war. The second section has to do with questions of fast and abstinence, and the third deals with matters concerning marriage and the family.

[2] This part of the *Singulari quadam* is not carried in Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum*. I have taken the text from *Sanctissimi D. N. Pii PP. IX epistola encyclica data die VIII Decembris MDCCCLXIV ad omnes catholicos antistites unacum syllabo praecipuorum aetatis nostrae errorum et actis pontificis ex quibus excerptus est syllabus* (Regensburg: Pustet, 1865), p. 78.

[3] The Latin text is in *The American Ecclesiastical Review (AER)*,

The *Singulari quadam* went on to indicate four of these errors which Pius IX denounced as threatening the purity of the Catholic faith throughout the world. They were 1) the teaching of the unbelievers and especially the *"clandestinarum societatum gregales"* who wanted to destroy all worship, 2) the tenets of those who wanted to make the Church subject to the State, 3) the doctrine of the rather naïve rationalists who flourished a century ago, and 4) the teaching of those who sought to deny or at least to minimize the dogma of the Church's necessity for salvation. The comparatively extensive section devoted to the explanation and repudiation of this last error has a tremendously important place in the history of Catholic teaching.

The *Si diligis*, on the other hand, does not go on to enumerate any series of errors. It refers to the encyclical *Humani generis* in such a way as to make it perfectly clear that the "spiritual contagion" against which the Bishops of the Catholic Church are being urged to fight in 1954 is, in general, the same lot of errors which Pope Pius XII pointed out and repudiated four years ago. The only new doctrinal inaccuracy to which the Holy Fathers refers in the *Si diligis* is that connected with the notion of a "lay theology."

In the *Si diligis*, the Holy Father proceeds in a positive manner, stating truth rather than repudiating error. He asserts that "Our purpose [in directing the energies of the Bishops against the symptoms and the effects of the spiritual contagion threatening the faithful] will be best effected by explaining the triple office and privilege, which, by divine institution, belongs to you, the successors of the Apostles, under the authority of the Roman Pontiff: namely that of teacher, of priest, and of ruler."[4]

In other words, the Vicar of Jesus Christ declared that he was convinced that the remedy against the doctrinal ineptitudes which threaten the faith and thus the salvation of God's people in our time must include and to some extent center around an accurate teaching of the theological treatise *De ecclesia militante*. The doctrine

---

CXXXI, 2 (Aug. 1954), 128. The English translation given out by the Vatican Press Office on May 31 is printed in that number of *AER* immediately after the text itself. The translation, however, is somewhat misleading in some places, so all references in this article are to the Latin text, since the translations carried here differ somewhat from the version printed last month.

[4] *Ibid.*

about the powers of teaching, governing, and sanctifying within the Church constitute the nucleus of the treatise. In the final analysis, that doctrine is the practical and immediate application of the central truth about the Church, a truth set forth in the *Mystici Corporis* and repeated in the *Humani generis,* the truth that the visible Catholic Church is actually the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ the Divine Redeemer.[5]

The Holy Father, in the *Si diligis,* stated that in this particular allocution he would deal only with the power of the *magisterium,* as it exists in the Bishops under the authority of the Roman Pontiff. He expressed himself as intending to speak about the other subjects later, if time would permit.

The body of teaching in the *Si diligis* will undoubtedly be included in future editions of Denzinger's *Enchiridion symbolorum.* Previous pronouncements by Pope Pius XII, together with this recent allocution, have made the present Holy Father's doctrinal contribution to the theological treatise *De ecclesia* more extensive than the individual contributions of any of his predecessors in the See of Peter.

The central thesis of the *Si diligis* is a development of a doctrine which had previously been set forth explicitly by Pope Leo XIII in his encyclical *Sapientiae christianae,* issued on Jan. 10, 1890. This encyclical declared that "the function of preaching, that is, of teaching, belongs by divine right to those teachers whom the Holy Ghost has placed as bishops to rule the Church of God, and especially to the Roman Pontiff, the vicar of Jesus Christ, placed with supreme power over the entire Church as teacher of faith and morals."[6]

The allocution of May 31, 1954, is much more explicit on this point.

Christ Our Lord entrusted the truth which He had brought from heaven to the Apostles, and through them, to their successors. He sent

---

[5] The *Mystici Corporis* offers the expression *"mysticum Iesu Christi Corpus"* as a definition of the *"Sancta, catholica, apostolica, Romana ecclesia."* (Cf. *AAS,* XXXV [July 20, 1943], 199.) The *Humani generis* blames those people who do not consider themselves bound to accept the teaching set forth in the *Mystici Corporis,* to the effect that "the Mystical Body of Christ and the Roman Catholic Church are one and the same." (Cf. *AER,* CXXIII, 5 [Nov. 1950], 391.)

[6] *DB,* 1936c.

His Apostles, as He had been sent by the Father, to teach all nations everything they had heard from Him. The Apostles are therefore by divine right the true doctors and teachers in the Church. Besides the lawful successors of the Apostles, namely the Roman Pontiff for the universal Church and the Bishops for the faithful entrusted to their care, there are no other teachers divinely constituted in the Church of Christ.[7]

The recent allocution brings out one point which had not previously been taught quite so explicitly in the documents of the ecclesiastical *magisterium*. It asserts that the Roman Pontiff and the residential Bishops within the Catholic Church are the only persons who have been entrusted with the power of teaching in an authoritative manner in the name and by the power of Jesus Christ. The Roman Pontiff possesses this power of *magisterium* for the universal Church militant. The various residential Bishops possess it, each for the local Church entrusted to his care. Both the *Sapientiae christianae* and the *Si diligis* are dealing here with the teaching power precisely in so far as it is authoritative. They are not concerned with the matter of infallibility.

The *Sapientiae christianae* goes on to speak of other teachers within the Church.

No one, however, must entertain the notion that private individuals are prevented from taking some active part in this duty of teaching, especially those on whom God has bestowed gifts of mind together with a desire to please God. These may not assume the role of teachers within the Church, but, as often as circumstances require it, they may assume the task of passing on to others what they themselves have received, becoming, as it were, the echo of the teachers' voice.[8]

The allocution *Si diligis* develops this teaching, insisting in a special way upon the fact that all other teachers within the Church are strictly subordinate to the hierarchy of jurisdiction, the Sovereign Pontiff and the residential Bishops within the Catholic Church.

But both the Bishops and, first of all, the Supreme Teacher and Vicar of Christ on earth, may associate others with themselves in their doctrinal work either as helpers or as advisers to whom they may delegate the faculty of teaching either by a special grant or by conferring an office to which this faculty is attached. Those who are called to the

---

[7] *AER*, CXXXI, 2 (Aug. 1954), 128. [8] *DB*, 1936c.

doctrinal work in this way act as teachers in the Church, not in any way in their own name nor by reason of theological knowledge they may possess, but rather because of the mandate they have received from the lawful *magisterium*. Their faculty always remains subject to that *magisterium*, nor is it ever exercised in its own right and independently.[9]

Where Pope Leo XIII was insisting upon the legitimacy and the propriety of having others besides members of the hierarchy of jurisdiction working as instructors in the Church, Pope Pius XII stresses the fact that these non-members of the hierarchy teach in the Church legitimately only if they have been called in as subordinates by members of the *ecclesia docens* and only if they continue their work of instruction precisely as subordinates.

This passage of the *Si diligis* is basically a repudiation of what we might call irresponsible doctrinal activity within the true Church of Jesus Christ. According to the terminology used in this allocution there is no room for any teachers within the Church except the members of the *ecclesia docens* and individuals who have been invited by them to act as their helpers and advisers in the doctrinal field and accepted as such. There is no such thing as a work of teaching in the Church outside of and independent of the hierarchy of jurisdiction, or distinct from the doctrinal activity of the hierarchy.

It is quite helpful to compare what the *Si diligis* has to say on this point with the teaching of Pope Leo XIII in the encyclical *Sapientiae christianae*. The encyclical clearly states that Catholics who are not members of the *ecclesia docens* have absolutely no right to arrogate to themselves the position of teachers within the Church of God. They are to aid in the work of teaching, they are to act as an image or echo of the teaching of the hierarchy, but, in the context of the *Sapientiae christianae*, it turns out that this activity is one of teaching by example and of aiding in the work of the *ecclesia docens* as such.[10] The allocution *Si diligis* has made this thesis considerably clearer.

This, it must be understood, is a direct and necessary implication from the very constitution of the Church militant of the New Testament. It is not a matter of mere ecclesiastical policy. It does not

[9] *AER*, CXXXI, 2 (Aug. 1954), 128 f.
[10] Cf. *DB*, 1936c.

lie within the power of the hierarchy now or at any other time to authorize or to allow men who are not members of the Church's hierarchy of jurisdiction to act as teachers within the Church apart from the supervision and the control of the *ecclesia docens*. Again it must be stressed that, in the light of the teaching of the *Si diligis* and of the *Sapientiae christianae*, there is absolutely no room for irresponsible teaching activity within the Church of God.

The allocution goes on to discuss the case of those men to whom the members of the hierarchy have certainly given the commission to aid them in their doctrinal mission. The Sovereign Pontiff reminds the Bishops that they "for their part, by conferring this faculty, are not deprived of the right to teach" and that "they retain the grave obligation of providing for and of watching over the integrity and the security of the doctrine which others, whom they have taken on to help them, propose."[11] As a matter of fact the allocution goes out of its way to focus the attention of the Catholic world on the fact that the Bishops are the divinely constituted teachers within the Church, and that this doctrinal responsibility of theirs is anything but a dead letter in the Church.

As a matter of fact, the allocution insists that the Bishops should not only supervise and direct the teaching of the faithful, but that they should take an active and primary part in the teaching activity themselves. The final exhortation delivered to the assembled members of the hierarchy in the *Si diligis* is a plea that the Bishops devote themselves more and more to the study of theology and to the work of teaching or preaching.

> With daily increasing diligence, Venerable Brothers, as both the duty and the privilege of your office demand of you, devote yourselves to searching and penetrating more and more into the sublimity and profundity of supernatural truth, and with eloquence inflamed by zeal make known the holy truths of religion to those who, at the present time, not without threat of extremely grave dangers, are being engulfed by the darkness of error in matters of both mind and heart.[12]

The allocution makes it perfectly clear that not only is the Bishop supposed to exercise the teaching function himself, but that the men whom he has chosen to aid him in this field have absolutely no

[11] *AER*, CXXXI, 2 (Aug. 1954), 129.
[12] *Ibid.*, 131.

complaint to make when he does his duty and examines their doctrinal activity. Here are the pertinent words of the allocution.

> Therefore the legitimate Teaching Authority (*Magisterium*) of the Church is guilty of no injury or no offence to any of those to whom it has given a canonical mission, if it desires to ascertain what they, whom it has sent to teach, are proposing and defending in their lectures, in books, notes, and reviews intended for the use of their students, as well as in books or other publications intended for the general public.[13]

This, of course, is merely an application of the truth set forth previously in this same allocution: the truth that subordinate teachers exercise their function in the Church only by reason of the faculty or the commission they have received from the *ecclesia docens* itself and that their commission remains always subject to the power of the *magisterium*. In other words, the only man who, not being a member of the *ecclesia docens*, still teaches legitimately within the Church must necessarily be one who acts as the instrument, the agent, or the assistant of the Bishop.

The Holy Father, in the allocution *Si diligis*, went on to say that he had no intention of extending the provisions of canon law which govern the previous censorship of books to cover all of the kinds of expressions employed by teachers to bring their own doctrines to their own students or to the public. The provisions of canon law to which the allocution refers apply to books and articles which are published, that is, addressed to the general public.[14] They do not apply to writings which are limited to private use, that is, to the service of the students actually attending the classes in which this material is taught. Obviously they do not apply to what is given as a spoken lecture in class.

At the same time, however, the Sovereign Pontiff made it clear that his unwillingness to extend the process of censorship to oral lectures and to unpublished class notes was not motivated by any thought that the content of these things was of no concern to him or to the rest of the *ecclesia docens*, but sprang from the fact that there were many other ways, presumably just as effective, by which the *magisterium* can ascertain what is being taught by the professors under its direction. The *Si diligis* clearly implies that the mem-

[13] *Ibid.*, 129.

[14] Cf. *can.* 1385.

bers of the *ecclesia docens*, if they are not already employing these means, certainly should make use of them as soon as possible.

Once again the Holy Father returns to the idea that this foresight and circumspection on the part of the *magisterium* does not in any way involve or imply any lack of confidence in the men whose teaching the *magisterium* inspects and supervises. He adds, as an aside, that the imposition upon teachers and many others of the obligation of making a profession of faith and taking the Anti-Modernist Oath does not mean any lack of confidence in the individuals upon whom the obligation is placed. "On the contrary," the Holy Father insists, "the fact that the office of teachers has been bestowed implies confidence in, a high regard for, and honor shown to the person to whom this function has been entrusted."[15]

The *Si diligis* thus focuses attention on the fact that teaching is a sacred activity within the Church. The man who expounds the doctrines of the Catholic faith acts as an ambassador of Christ. No one has any right whatsoever to arrogate that function to himself. If he is called to aid in this work by the power which comes from Our Lord and which depends upon Him in every moment and act of its exercise, he is by that very fact being honored in a special way. He would be ungrateful and would show himself unaware of the meaning of the message he is supposed to teach if he were to allow himself to resent the inspection, the supervision, and the direction which the *ecclesia docens* is obliged to carry on.

In the next passage in the May 31 allocution there seems to be a reference to some stupid adverse criticism once made against St. Pius X. Sympathizers with the Modernists, even in very recent times, have vehemently deplored what they regarded as a tendency on the part of the "Integralists," the opponents of Modernism, to delate to Rome writings which they considered hostile to the Catholic faith. Ultimately this clamorous disapproval on the part of the Modernists and their admirers was directed against the *Sodalitium Pianum*, a more or less loosely organized group which, in the reign of St. Pius X, worked to keep the Holy See informed about doctrinal developments throughout the Catholic world.[16] St. Pius X gave his name and his support to this group.

[15] *AER, loc. cit.*

[16] An interesting and valuable discussion of this topic is to be found in *Pie X et la France* by Hary Mitchell (Paris: Les Éditions du Cèdre, 1954), pp. 153-70.

Hence the following statement in the *Si diligis* has a special reference to the activities of St. Pius X.

> Indeed, the Holy See, whenever it inquires and wishes to be informed about what is being taught in certain seminaries, colleges, universities, and institutions of higher learning, in those fields that pertain to its jurisdiction, is moved by no other motive than the consciousness of Christ's mandate and of the obligation by which it is bound in the sight of God to safeguard sound doctrine and to preserve it incorrupt and entire. Moreover the exercise of this vigilance aims also at protecting and upholding your right and duty to nourish the flock entrusted to your pastoral care with the genuine teaching and truth of Christ.[17]

The next section of the *Si diligis* blames the doctrinal evils of the "spiritual contagion" against which the allocution itself is directed on a neglect of the teaching of the living *magisterium* of the Catholic Church, and of the clearly stated *doctrina communis* of the Church. According to the Holy Father, this neglect of Catholic teaching arises from the fact that the guilty teachers place too much reliance on their own mental powers, on the modern frame of mind, and on the standards accepted in studies other than sacred theology, standards which the unfortunates who spread false teaching within the Church are naïve enough to accept as the only guides in the line of scholarly activity.

> For unfortunately it has happened that certain teachers care little for conformity with the living Teaching Authority (*Magisterium*) of the Church, and pay little attention to its *doctrina communis* which is clearly set forth in one way or another. At the same time they place too much reliance on their own intellectual ability, on the mental attitude of recent writers, and on the standards of other studies, which they describe and consider to be the only ones that conform to the real nature and norms of scholarship.[18]

The allocution goes on to explain that the men whose errors made necessary the writing of the encyclical *Humani generis* four years ago, and the purveyors of false teachings who had to be rebuked by St. Pius X and by his successor, Pope Benedict XV, were all guilty of neglecting the teaching of the living *magisterium* of the Church and of trying to introduce doctrinal novelties into the life of the Church. This section of the *Si diligis* ends on a stern note.

[17] *AER, loc. cit.* [18] *Ibid.*, 130.

And if there are any present-day teachers and professors who are taking every occasion and expanding every effort to produce and develop new ideas rather than trying to restate "that which has been handed down," and if this is their only aim; they should reflect calmly on what Pope Benedict XV sets forth for their consideration in the encyclical just mentioned. "We wish to have this law of the ancients: '*Nihil innovetur nisi quod traditum est,*' held in reverence. This must be held as an inviolable law in matters of faith. It should also be influential on matters that can be subject to change, although in these latter, for the most part, the rule holds: '*Non nova, sed noviter.*'"[19]

The second section of the allocution speaks of the place of the laity in the teaching work of the Catholic Church, and denounces some extravagances of a so-called "lay theology." It opens with a statement of the fact that the Bishops of the Church can summon and admit both lay men and lay women as helpers in the work of defending the faith. Once again the *Si diligis* makes it perfectly clear that the teaching work in the Church is *entirely* under the direction of the hierarchy of jurisdiction.

As far as the laity is concerned, it is clear that both men and women can be invited or admitted as helpers in the defence of the faith. It is enough to call to mind the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in which so many thousands of men and women are working, as well as the other branches of the apostolate of the laity. All of these are highly praiseworthy and can and should be promoted in every way. But all of these lay people must be and must stay under the authority, the leadership, and the vigilance of those who have been established by divine institution as teachers within the Church of Christ. In matters pertaining to the salvation of souls there is no teaching activity in the Church exempt from that authority and vigilance.[20]

The press of our country, in its somewhat meager report on the allocution *Si diligis,* concentrated its attention on the single brief section in which the so-called "lay theology" is mentioned. Actually that paragraph does nothing more than restate and confirm the central point of the allocution itself, the dominant truth that there is and there can be within the Church of God no teaching activity not immediately under the direction of the *ecclesia docens,* the Sovereign Pontiff and the residential Bishops of the Church. The "lay theology" is designated in this section as something quite danger-

[19] *Ibid.,* 130.

[20] *Ibid.*

ous, but the only thesis which is specifically condemned is the denial of subjection of lay teachers in the Church to the hierarchy.

In recent times a so-called "lay theology" has arisen in various places and has spread abroad everywhere, and a special class of "lay theologians" has come into existence, claiming to act on their own authority (*qui sui iuris esse profitentur*). There are lectures in this theology, and there are also published writings, seminars, professorial chairs, and professors. These people distinguish their teaching activity from, and in some way set it up against, the public teaching authority of the Church. Sometimes, in order to justify their position, they appeal to the charismatic gifts of teaching and interpreting, which are mentioned several times in the New Testament, especially in the Epistles of St. Paul. They also appeal to a history which, from the beginning of the Christian religion until the present time, brings forward so many names of laymen who, for the good of souls, have taught Christ's truth orally and in writing, although they have not been called to this by the Bishops and have neither asked for nor received any commission to engage in the sacred teaching ministry, but are moved by their own inward impulse and by their apostolic zeal.

Actually these statements which are just the opposite to their claims are what we must hold as true: that there never has been, there is not, and there will never be, any legitimate teaching activity of the laity in the Church which is exempted by God from the authority, the leadership, and the vigilance of the sacred *magisterium;* and that the very denial of submission offers convincing proof and evidence that laymen who speak and act in this way are not guided by the Spirit of God and Christ. Furthermore, everyone can see how great a danger of unrest and error there is in this "lay theology." There is also the danger that incompetent men may begin to instruct their fellows, men who are deceitful and treacherous, men whom St. Paul described when he said "The time will come when men . . . always itching to hear something fresh, will provide themselves with a continuous succession of new teachers, as the whim takes them, turning a deaf ear to the truth, bestowing their attention on fables instead."[21]

In bringing the allocution to a close, the Holy Father reminds the Bishops of the duty that devolves upon them by reason of their position as the only divinely constituted teachers within the Church militant of the New Testament. They are the men whom God Himself has made responsible for the spiritual nourishment of His

[21] *Ibid.*, 131.

people. They have willingly assumed that responsibility. Therefore it is their duty to devote themselves generously and enthusiastically to the study of the divine truth which they are commissioned to impart. It is their duty to be lavish in the expenditure of their efforts to present this divine message accurately and as effectively as possible to the people who need it so badly.

God's public revelation is addressed, through the *ecclesia docens*, to people who are engulfed in the darkness of error in matters of thought and of sentiment. And it is addressed to them "so that, by doing penance in a salutary way, and by loving Him as they ought, they may finally come back to God."[22]

Thus the Sovereign Pontiff reminds these successors of the Apostles that their message is the very one their Master preached during the course of His public life on earth. And the Evangelists summarized that message when they described Him as preaching: "Do penance, for the kingdom of heaven is at hand."[23]

In their capacity as the only divinely constituted teachers within the Church, the members of the *ecclesia docens* are obliged to devote themselves to the work of religious instruction, and to control and to supervise the doctrinal activity of those among the faithful whom they invite and accept as helpers in their own teaching function. The body of truth which they are commissioned to teach, and which no one can impart legitimately except under their direction, is the divine message which men need for the attainment of their eternal salvation.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[22] *Ibid.*
[23] Cf. *Matt.* 4:17; *Mark* 1:15.

Answers to Questions

THE EUCHARISTIC FAST

Question: A priest has suffered a coronary thrombosis, but is again able to perform his sacred duties. He is assigned to say the 8 and the 10 o'clock Masses on Sunday. In view of his previous ailment may he take liquid nourishment up to the beginning of his first Mass?

Answer: It is a reasonable interpretation of the Constitution *Christus Dominus* to hold that one who fears that he may be afflicted with sickness unless he takes some liquid nourishment or medicine before the celebration of Mass or the reception of Holy Communion is entitled to this privilege. Thus, Fr. John Ford, S.J., in his excellent commentary on this Constitution, says: "A person who is not sick at the moment but who foresees that he will be sick and will suffer grave inconvenience unless he takes medicine or liquid is entitled to the dispensation and may take the nourishment or medicine in order to forestall the sickness" (*The New Eucharistic Legislation* [New York, 1953], p. 75).

Certainly, a priest in the circumstances described by the questioner has reason to fear a recurrence of the ailment he has previously experienced, and hence is entitled to medicine or liquid nourishment before either of the two Masses or both. Such medicine or liquid may be taken even immediately before the Masses.

HOLY COMMUNION FOR THE MENTALLY RETARDED CHILD

Question: What course should be followed in allowing a mentally retarded child to receive Holy Communion?

Answer: The questioner presents a problem which occurs quite frequently, and yet is not easy to solve. According to the discipline prevailing in the Latin Church, a child who is so defective intellectually as to have no understanding or appreciation of the Blessed

Sacrament may not be given Holy Communion even in danger of death. The Code prescribes that outside the danger of death (for in danger of death all that is necessary is that the little one be able to distinguish the Blessed Sacrament from common food and to adore the Body of Christ reverently) a child must understand according to his capacity those mysteries of faith that are necessary for salvation by necessity of means and approach the Holy Eucharist with the devotion suitable to his tender years (*Can.* 854).

In practice it is often difficult to apply these rules to children who have not attained to normal intellectual development. Evidently, those who are classified as idiots (with an I.Q. less than 20) should be excluded from the reception of the Holy Eucharist. But this same rule should not be applied to morons (with an I.Q. from 50 to 70) nor even to all imbeciles (with an I.Q. from 20 to 50). Those persons who are charged with the spiritual care of retarded children who offer any hope of reaching the required mental capacity for Holy Communion should be prepared to give them a long course of instruction, patiently repeating over and over again the necessary doctrines. When this work of zeal has been properly performed, many of those children who at first seemed incapable of the minimum knowledge required for First Communion may eventually manifest the requirements for even the frequent reception of the Blessed Eucharist. Such, at least, is the belief of those who have had considerable experience in caring for children of this type.

Thus, a religious engaged in the care of mentally retarded children wrote:

> The mentally deficient child can arrive at an appreciation of religious truths if given instruction adapted to his mental capacity. Those children who have been given formal religious instruction over a period of years are found to possess a degree of knowledge and ability for practical application of the truths of Catholicism sufficient to permit them to receive the sacraments of Penance, Holy Communion and Confirmation. From the data obtained in the study it would seem that a period of three years or more of religious instruction prior to the reception of the sacraments is desirable for those children on the higher levels of the imbecile group and also those in the moron group.

At the convention of the National Catholic Educational Association in 1952, Msgr. Feider, chaplain of St. Coletta School, Jefferson,

Wisconsin, made this statement: "Our patients range in I.Q. from 30 to 80, with an average I.Q. of about 50. According to our experience, all patients with an I.Q. of 40 or higher can, with proper direction, be brought to the sacraments. I also find that most of those in the range from 30 to 40 I.Q. can be trained to be communicants" (*Bulletin, NCEA,* August, 1952, p. 218).

On this same occasion Msgr. Feider stated that about 95 per cent of those who have been admitted to the sacraments in his institution are daily communicants.

It should also be noted that the decree *Quam singulari* in which St. Pius X rendered the Holy Eucharist available to children as soon as they reach the age of reason contains the comforting assurance that they need not possess the full use of reason. "Nor is the full use of reason necessary, but the incipient use is sufficient—that is, some kind of use of reason (*aliqualis usus rationis*)" (*AAS,* II [1910], 581).

In this connection it is useful to quote the prescription of the Code regarding those who have the right and duty to judge the fitness of a child for Holy Communion: "Regarding the sufficient disposition of children for First Communion the judgment should pertain to their confessor and their parents or those who take the place of the parents. It is the duty of the pastor to see to it, even by an examination if he prudently judges it opportune, that children shall not approach the Holy Table before the use of reason or without sufficient disposition" (*Can.* 854).

Those who have the spiritual care of mentally retarded children should not be too ready to decide that a child is not sufficiently intelligent to receive Holy Communion. I am inclined to say that any child who can express ideas in speech, even though very simply and confusedly, can be presumed to be capable of receiving Holy Communion if proper training is provided.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

SANCTUARY CARPET

Question: We are making arrangements for a new carpet in our sanctuary. There is a great discussion about the proper color for the sanctuary carpet. Please settle our problem.

Answer The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* suggests that the entire floor of the sanctuary be covered with a green carpet. We read in Anson's book (*Churches, Their Plan and Furnishings*) when speaking of carpeting in the sanctuary that, even though the above recommendation has been made, "there is no special reason why any particular colour should be used. . . . There is very little to be said in favour of carpets supposed to be of 'ecclesiastical design.' i.e., covered with sacred emblems."

RELICS ON ALTAR

Question: Recently, at a parish celebration, the priest offering the Mass incensed a reliquary located on the gradine of the altar. Is it permissible to place relics on the altar?

Answer: The *Caeremoniale episcoporum* recommends placing relics on the altar on the occasion of some great feast or celebration. However, they are not part of the essential decoration of the altar.

We are warned that relics should not be placed in reliquaries that resemble too closely the monstrance in which the Blessed Sacrament is exposed for fear of misleading the faithful. Relics are not to be placed on the altar during exposition of the Blessed Sacrament.

Msgr. Collins states that the normal place for the exposition of relics is on the altar at each side of the candlesticks. The Congregation of Sacred Rites adds that on the altar of the Blessed Sacrament relics may be placed only between the candlesticks.

The Rubrics of the Missal direct the celebrant to incense relics exposed on the altar for veneration. The celebrant, after incensing the cross and making the proper reverences, incenses the relics with two double swings, whatever the number of reliquaries present. He does not leave the middle of the altar to incense the relics and he is further instructed to incense the one on the gospel side first. Moreover the reliquary nearest the tabernacle or cross is incensed first.

SIMILAR STATUES

Question: I just have been assigned to a new parish and find in the church two statues of the Blessed Virgin. I recall that there

is some legislation about this but am not clear on it. Kindly give me the required information.

Answer: The Congregation of Sacred Rites in a decision (No. 3732) forbids two statues of the same saint in the same church. As for the Blessed Virgin two statues may be allowed so long as they are not of the same title. For example, a statue of the Immaculate Conception would be permitted with a statue of Our Lady of Fatima or Lourdes since two distinct titles or prerogatives of the Blessed Mother are emphasized.

HOLY OILS

Question: We are situated in a mission area and at a great distance from the See city. Is that sufficient reason for not renewing the holy oils and using the same supply for a couple of years?

Answer: The Code of Canon Law states that a pastor is obliged to secure a supply of holy oils blessed on Maundy Thursday to take care of his needs for a year. Old oils should not be used but should be properly disposed of. Only in case of necessity may old oils be used in the administration of the sacraments.

THIRTEEN HOURS' DEVOTION

Question: At our parish we have Thirteen Hours' Devotion and not the Forty Hours' Devotion due to the difficulty of getting people together for the periods of adoration. Are these good people deprived of the indulgences attached to the Forty Hours' Devotion?

Answer: Those of the faithful who participate in a Eucharistic Day, such as the Thirteen Hours' Devotion, where the Blessed Sacrament is publicly exposed from morning until evening can gain the same indulgences as at the Forty Hours' Devotion under the same condition (*Preces et pia opera*, No. 147).

MISSA CANTATA

Question: Is it proper at a *Missa cantata* to place the chalice on the altar before the celebrant leaves the sacristy? I have seen some priests leave the chalice on the altar after the Mass and return to the sacristy without it. Is there any rubric about these customs?

Answer: Fortescue tells us that at the more solemn form of the *Missa cantata* the chalice is placed on the altar. By more solemn form he states that "it supposes a M.C., acolytes, thurifer, torch-bearers and partakes of the nature of High Mass, except for the absence of sacred ministers." Normally and with the daily *Missa cantata* the rubrics are much the same as those of the Low Mass. No word is ever mentioned by rubricists relative to leaving the chalice on the altar when returning to the sacristy.

EXPOSITION MASS PROBLEM

Question: We are instructed to add the oration of the Blessed Sacrament when exposition follows after Mass. What is the interpretation given to the phrase "statim post missam"?

Answer: If exposition follows immediately after Mass, without the celebrant retiring to the sacristy but unvesting either at the foot of the altar or at the sedilia, we feel that the priest should include the additional oration at his Mass. However, if he goes to the sacristy immediately after concluding the Leonine prayers to put on the cope, there seems to be two distinct ceremonies and he would not be required to add the extra oration.

CANDLES AROUND COFFIN OR CATAFALQUE

Question: Is there any special way to arrange the candles around the coffin or catafalque? I have seen them placed near the front pew, three on either side. Is there a specific rule about the number of candles surrounding the coffin?

Answer: The rubric of the Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. III) states simply that the coffin is to be placed in the middle of the church "cereis accensis circa corpus." Nothing is said about the number of candles but the implication is that the candles should in some way surround the body. The custom is to have six candles and these of unbleached wax. However, there seems to be no legislation forbidding more than six candles surrounding the coffin or catafalque.

PROPER DRESS FOR HOLY COMMUNION DISTRIBUTION

Question: Is it liturgically correct for a chaplain at an institution to distribute Holy Communion to the sick after his Mass while still retaining his amice, alb and stole?

Answer: The Ritual directs the priest to wear a surplice and white stole when distributing Holy Communion to the sick outside of church. It would seem the same regulation would apply to our chaplain in question.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for September, 1904, entitled "The Sacred Vessels and their Appurtenances," by the anonymous S.L.T., describes in detail the liturgical requirements for the chalice, paten, ciborium, corporal, pall, etc. The author states that the chalice and the paten lose their consecration when they are regilt—a statement that is no longer true in view of the explicit assertion of the Code that a chalice and paten do not lose their consecration because of the renewal of the gold plating (*Can.* 1305, § 2). . . . John Freeland, of Ely, England, contributes "Lay Thoughts on Preaching and Sermons" in the form of a dialogue between two laymen on modern preaching. One complains: "The preacher of today lives in the past. He thinks in a manner long since obsolete. He attacks difficulties no longer existing. His arguments are of the Middle Ages." . . . Fr. T. Kelly, S.J., explains the way of training the voice for preaching, particularly by a proper breathing technique. . . . Fr. W. B. O'Dowd, of Birmingham, England, writes on "The First Edict against the Christians." Contrary to some historians who stated that the first anti-Christian edict in the Roman Empire was issued by Trajan, he holds that Nero ruled that the Christian name should be a crime punishable by death. . . . In the Studies and Conferences section we find the prescriptions of St. Pius X concerning ecclesiastical students in Rome, containing the ruling that "Foreign students must reside in the colleges of their respective nations, and providing that such an institution does not exist in Rome, then in some other ecclesiastical college." . . . There is a lengthy notice of Archbishop Merry del Val's book *The Truth of Papal Claims*, which the reviewer describes as "a clear presentment, in language purposely simple, of the grounds on which the papal claims to supremacy of jurisdiction and an infallible *magisterium* rest."

F. J. C.

Analecta

The letter from the Sacred Congregation of Rites on the subject of the use of the English language in the administration of some Sacraments and in funeral services.

A) *The Latin Text*

SACRA CONGREGATIO
RITUUM

Prot. N. D. 18/954

DIOECESIUM AMERICAE SEPTENTRIONALIS

Exc.mus ac Rev.mus Dominus Carolus Josephus Alter, Archiepiscopus Cincinnatensis, nomine et auctoritate omnium Archiepiscoporum et Episcoporum Statuum Foederatorum Americae Septentrionalis, Sanctissimum Dominum nostrum Pium Papam XII. enixe adprecatus est, ut de Sua suprema Auctoritate, in administratione quorundam Sacramentorum, Baptismi nempe, Extremae Unctionis ac Matrimonii, nec non et in Exequiis Defunctorum, usum linguae anglicae in determinatis precibus indulgere benigne dignaretur, juxta exemplar a Commissione speciali liturgica exaratum, in quo, ad intelligentiam et pietatem populi, vulgari idiomate, anglico nempe, ii ritus et orationes positae sunt, quae magis opportunae videbantur. Quam Rituum Collectionem, ad instar Appendicis Ritualis Romani ita concinnatam, Sacrorum Rituum Congregationis judicio, pro opportuna approbatione reverenter subiecit.

Sacra porro Rituum Congregatio, utendo peculiaribus facultatibus sibi ab Ipso Sanctissimo Domino nostro tributis, exhibito Rituali diligenti studio perpenso, prae oculis habitis hodiernis circumstantiis, benigne indulsit ut:

1. Confici possit pro Statibus Foederatis Americae Septentrionalis novum Rituale, in quo textus latinus integer referatur, translatio vero anglica in iis quae permittuntur, juxta textum latinum ponatur.

2. In collatione vero Sacramentorum, in quantum ad intelligentiam et pietatem populi necesse sit, sacerdos vernacula lingua proferre potest ea tantum quae sequentur:

a). In administratione Baptismi parvulorum, solo in textu latino ponantur ac proinde semper et sola lingua hac dicantur exorcismi, omnes formulae unctionum ac benedictionum, nec non et ipsa Baptismi forma.

b). In administratione Baptismi adultorum, praeter ea quae superius recensita sunt, etiam lingua latina tantum imprimantur et recitentur psalmi et aliae preces initiales.

c). In ordine administrandi Sacramentum Extremae Unctionis, latina tantum lingua adhibeatur in oratione impositionis manuum super infirmum, in verbis unctionum et in orationibus subsequentibus.

d). In celebratione Matrimonii lingua anglica sacerdos uti potest ad omnia, praeter benedictionem anuli et formulam "Ego coniungo vos . . . ". In benedictione nuptiali extra Missam, danda ex apostolico indulto quando Missa non litatur, preces quae in Rituali Romano habentur, recitari possunt lingua anglica.

e). In Exequiis peragendis pro fidelibus defunctis, sola lingua latina preces et absolutiones peragi debent. Nihil tamen vetat quominus, hoc ritu absoluto, vulgari lingua aliae addantur preces, pro opportunitate temporis et loci, ab Ordinariis determinandae et ab ipso sacerdote recitandae.

Contrariis quibuscumque, etiam speciali mentione dignis, minime obstantibus, et servatis de cetero servandis.

Iniungitur insuper onus transmittendi ad S. Rituum Congregationem duo exemplaria praefati Ritualis, postquam typis editum fuerit.

Datum Romae die 3 Junii Anni Marialis 1954.

(s) CAIETANUS CARD. CICOGNANI
S.R.C. Praef.

(SEAL)

✠ A. Carinci, Archiep. Seleucien., S.R.C. a secretis.

B) *An Approved English translation*

His Excellency the Most Reverend Karl Joseph Alter, Archbishop of Cincinnati, in the name and with the authority of all the Archbishops and Bishops of the United States of America, has earnestly petitioned His Holiness Pope Pius XII, that by his supreme authority he graciously deign to permit, in the administration of some of the Sacraments, namely Baptism, Extreme Unction, and Matrimony, as well as in the funeral rites for the dead, the use of the English language in certain prayers, according to the copy drafted by a special liturgical Commission in which, for the understanding and piety of the people, those rites and prayers that seemed more suitable are set down in the vernacular, namely English. This collection of Rites, arranged as in the Appendix of the Roman Ritual, he reverently submitted to the judgment of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, for approval.

Whereupon the Sacred Congregation of Rites, using the special faculties given it by the Holy Father himself, having given diligent study to the Ritual submitted, taking contemporary circumstances into consideration, has graciously granted that:

1. A new Ritual may be drawn up for the United States of America, in which the Latin text is given in full, and an English translation of the portions permitted is placed alongside the Latin text.

2. In conferring the Sacraments, however, the priest may use the vernacular, insofar as is necessary for the understanding and piety of the people, only as follows:

a) In administering Baptism to infants, the exorcisms, all the formulas of anointing and blessing, and also the actual words of Baptism, shall be given only in Latin text and furthermore shall be spoken always and only in that language.

b) In administering Baptism to adults, besides what is specified above, the psalms and other initials prayers shall be printed and recited only in Latin.

c) In administering the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, only the Latin language shall be used in the prayer of the imposition of hands over the sick person, in the words of anointing, and in the prayers that follow.

d) In the celebration of Matrimony, the priest may use the English language for everything except the blessing of the ring and the formula "Ego Coniungo vos. . . ." ("I unite you . . . .") In the Nuptial Blessing outside of Mass, given by apostolic indult when Mass is not celebrated, the prayers in the Roman Ritual may be recited in English.

e) In funeral rites for the deceased faithful, the prayers and absolutions should be performed only in Latin. But nothing forbids that, once this rite has been completed, other prayers be added in the vernacular, as may befit the time and place. These prayers are to be determined by the Ordinaries and recited by the priest himself.

Anything to the contrary, even though worthy of special mention, in no way withstanding, and everything else being observed that should be observed.

There is enjoined, further, the obligation of forwarding to the Sacred Congregation of Rites two copies of the aforementioned Ritual, after it has been published.

Given at Rome June 3 of the Marian Year 1954.

(s) GAETANO CARDINAL CICOGNANI
Prefect

(SEAL)
✠ A. Carinci, Archbishop of Seleucia, Secretary

Book Reviews

CARDINAL GASQUET. A MEMOIR. By Shane Leslie. New York: P. J. Kenedy and Sons. 1954. Pp. ix + 273. $3.50.

"Though I don't think I waste my time, still the days race by and at the end of each I have to say another gone and so much left undone!" (p. 183). This diary entry of January, 1912, must at many times have described the state of mind of Francis Aidan Gasquet during the lengthy span of his crowded and busy life. For it can truthfully be said that he was often asked to do too many things for one to expect that he should do them all well. His life (1846-1929) was filled with tasks of the greatest complexity and time-consuming character, including such varied services to the Church as the reform of the English Benedictines, the writing of serious works in history, the controversy over Anglican orders, the guidance of the English diplomatic mission to the Holy See at the opening of World War I, and the revision of the Vulgate. Gasquet did not perform all these assignments equally well, but he did leave the stamp of a broad and constructive mind on the Benedictines of the English congregation, the case of Anglican orders, Anglo-papal diplomatic relations in the months after December, 1914, and on the early organizational efforts in behalf of the papal commission for the Vulgate's revision. He can likewise be credited with having turned the tide of English historiography more in favor of the monastic establishments which had existed before Henry VIII's break with Rome, even though his historical works cannot in many respects stand the test of close scrutiny.

It is a bit difficult to determine precisely what kind of a book Sir Shane Leslie had in mind to write about Gasquet. It is variously referred to as "a memoir" (title page), "biography" (p. vii), and as a memoir in the nature of "a series of Essays" touching the high peaks of the subject's life (p. 10). The last description is probably the truest one. We have the author's own word for it that it is not intended as a definitive biography, for when he states that the principal sources used were the Gasquet Papers in the archives of Downside Abbey, documents which are, he says, numerous enough to make possible the writing of many volumes on Gasquet, he adds that he used "only a tithe" of the papers (p. 11). There need be, then, no further doubt as to the partial character of the present study. On a further point there can be no doubt, namely, that Sir Shane often writes brilliantly, and

throughout the volume the reader frequently meets striking passages such as the sentence that is used to describe Gasquet's disappointment at the manner in which his fellow English historian, James Gairdner, used certain materials which the Benedictine had secured for him from the Vatican Archives. Leslie says: "Gasquet felt like an eagle wounded by the arrow tipped with his own feathers" (p. 129). And near the end of the book the pages which are devoted to a retrospect of the old Benedictine cardinal's life are again writing of a very high order (pp. 262-64). But, unfortunately, the urge to employ a colorful phrase can at times do a disservice to history. The author maintains, for example, that Gasquet as an English cardinal in residence at the Roman Curia during World War I, "was as strange a phenomenon as a Patagonian Eminence in the Roman corridors" (p. 213)—a fine phrase, to be sure, but a misleading one. Henry Stuart, Duke of York, was made a cardinal in 1747 and served a good portion of his life in the Roman Curia, and after his death in 1807 there came successively four other English cardinals *in curia*: Charles Erskine, Thomas Weld, Charles Acton, and Edward Howard up to 1892 when the last-named died as Bishop of Frascati.

A fair portion of this book is devoted to printing letters to and from Gasquet, many of which are, indeed, often highly interesting and sometimes quite revealing. But the method in which this correspondence is handled leaves a good deal to be desired. If a reader is expected to comprehend the full import of many of these letters, surely some background should have been supplied as, for instance, in the chapter on Gasquet's role in the case of Anglican orders (pp. 52-79). An even more notable example is Sir Shane's failure to provide at least a general description of the difficulties within the Benedictine Order in England at the time of Gasquet's letters to Edmund Bishop (pp. 135-65). There probably will not be one reader in a hundred who will understand such cryptic remarks as the one quoted from a letter of July 15, 1888, to the effect that "There was only rumour about Persico at Chapter" (p. 147); and from a letter of the following December 7, who but the specialist in the history of Downside can make anything out of such a statement as "It is impossible not to see that we have won the victory for which we have contended and suffered these ten years" (*ibid.*). Much that is contained in these letters is, in fact, so interesting that many readers, I suspect, will be annoyed by the lack of some identifications of persons and events, exact dates of letters, and in some cases even the names of those to whom they were addressed or from whom received. It is intriguing, for example, to have Gasquet telling Edmund Bishop in a letter of Sept. 12, 1886, about his accidental meeting in Paddington Station with "the President" with whom he had

an argument (pp. 135-36). But it would be surprising if more than a fraction of Sir Shane's readers had even a vague idea of who "the President" was.

One of the most discussed chapters in the book has been, and probably will continue to be, "Gasquet as a Historian" (pp. 103-34). On the whole it is well done and is a basically honest account, for here more than in any other phase of his life Gasquet may be said to have shown a slightly disingenuous side. Making all the allowance one can for his initial lack of training and for the many distractions and interruptions he underwent, his reputation will never be that of a truly first rate scholar. It is not necessary to have great sympathy for G. G. Coulton and his "pursuit" of Gasquet to recognize the indefensible conduct of the latter in having reprinted in 1908, without the slightest change or acknowledgment of error, an article of 1894 from the *Dublin Review* on the precedents for Wycliffe's version of the Scripture after a reviewer in the *Church Quarterly* of January, 1901, had exposed Gasquet's thesis as demonstrably false. (Considerable information on this point was summarized in the *Times Literary Supplement* of Feb. 19 and March 5, 1954, as a consequence of an earlier review of Leslie's work on Gasquet.)

But one need not return to the *Church Quarterly* of 1901 to find proof of Gasquet's defects as an historian. His present biographer furnishes considerable evidence himself in treating aspects of Gasquet's professional work such as the changes he made in the texts of Acton's letters (pp. 115-16) when he was editing them for the volume which he entitled *Lord Acton and His Circle* (London, 1906). Moreover, what Leslie includes here by way of entries from the diary that Gasquet kept on his visit of 1904 to the United States proves that the Benedictine was either a very careless observer and recorder or that he was most unfortunate in the choice of those from whom he sought information on American Catholic institutions. It likewise proves, incidentally, that Sir Shane is not himself a very safe guide in these matters. For example, after quoting a letter of July 14, 1904, to Gasquet from Cardinal Merry del Val wherein there was conveyed Pius X's blessing on the eve of Gasquet's departure for his American visit and wherein the presence of Cardinal Satolli in the United States at the time was remarked (p. 91), there follows a brief paragraph which is almost totally false. The error occurs as a result of Leslie's confusing the two visits of Satolli to this country in 1892 and 1904 and attributing the establishment of the Apostolic Delegation to the latter time, whereas it had been established by Leo XIII in January, 1893, and Satolli named the first delegate. Again on American affairs it should also be stated that in World War I Cardinal Gibbons did not proclaim his "sympathy for

the Allies from the opening of the War" (p. 220); nor did his friend, Monsignor Sigourney Fay, bring to Rome in 1918 anything that could rightly be called "White House sanctions" (p. 221).

But to return to Gasquet on the American Church. The biographer here quotes him as having visited St. Paul where he talked with Archbishop Ireland about what Gasquet quite wrongly called "the Benefit Societies for Catholics" and their condemnation by Rome (p. 93). As a matter of fact the Holy See never condemned any "benefit societies for Catholics." Moreover, on this controversial question Gasquet had a total of twenty-eight American archbishops, of whom fourteen were said to be in favor of these societies, two were neutral, and twelve were opposed. Since there were in all only fourteen archbishops in the United States in 1904, one would have to leave the explanation of how he arrived at the figure of twenty-eight American archbishops to the mathematics of the good Benedictine himself! And the entries given from Gasquet's diary about his visit to the East are no more reassuring as to his sense of accuracy than were the entries written in St. Paul. When he visited The Catholic University of America on October 28, 1904, he stated that the situation there had become "impossible" since three years before the archbishops had "handed over the whole management of the secular part to the Sulpician Fathers" (p. 94). It was quite true that the bankruptcy of the University's treasurer that summer had made matters extremely critical, but one may ask: where did Gasquet pick up the impression that the financial crisis was due to Sulpician management—or mismanagement—when in reality the Sulpicians had been in charge of the spiritual life of the students in Caldwell Hall since the University opened in 1889 but had never at any time been given the management of the "secular part" of the institution. A final instance of Gasquet's very imperfect reporting, and Leslie's faulty editing, is contained in the confused account of the visitor's lecture on Anglican orders at St. Joseph's Seminary in Yonkers, New York (p. 95). One would really not need much more than a knowledge of Gasquet's peculiar laxity about citing the exact texts of Acton's letters and the strange and confusing entries from his American diary of 1904 to understand how he had gotten into trouble with Coulton *et al* over the way in which he used the documentary evidence in a number of his historical works. Insofar as American Catholic history is concerned a corrective was readily at hand for Gasquet's biographer and any reader might rightly expect that Sir Shane would have noted and corrected Gasquet's errors, but in no instance has this been the case. That the Benedictine historian possessed a disarming personal manner may easily be adduced from an amusing episode related by Charles Johnson who said that at one

of the early Anglo-American historical conferences sponsored by the Institute of Historical Research in London he had met Coulton and they had taken lunch together. As soon as they sat down to the table Coulton exclaimed, "I have had a dreadful shock this morning. . . . I met Gasquet, and he's *such* a decent chap" (*Times Literary Supplement,* March 5, 1954). Leslie himself provides a further illustration of Gasquet's winning ways in dealing with fellow historians with whom he had serious differences of opinion. When the International Congress of Historical Sciences met in London in 1913 Gasquet invited the famous Monsignor Louis Duchesne, with whom he had clashed in the case of Anglican orders in 1896, and whose book, *Histoire ancienne de l'église,* had been put on the Index the previous year, to be his guest. Duchesne could not help but have felt grateful for the kindly courtesy, but he believed that it was scarcely the time for him to appear in such a gathering as a representative of Catholic historical scholarship. *"Tempus tacendi,"* he replied (p. 131).

Another aspect of this book that deserves to be mentioned is the somewhat careless language that is employed in speaking of theological questions. When treating the modernist movement, for example, it is hardly fair either to Cardinal Merry del Val or to Gasquet to say that the former's new broom at the Vatican was sweeping clean and that it had turned on some of Gasquet's "Liberal friends"—only to follow this statement by the brief sentence: "Geniuses like Tyrrell and Loisy were lost to the Church" (p. 90). To say this seems to imply that these two modernists were lost because of Merry del Val's stern methods of repressing doctrinal error. But if that was Leslie's meaning, it is in error, for Loisy had shown heretical leanings as far back as the early 1890's. And it is likewise underrating Gasquet's discernment to quote him in compliment of Loisy in 1893, for it took most men—and not Gasquet alone—a long while to know where Loisy really stood. Other strange expressions speak of a "far from mythical" succession from the apostles to the pope, and of the pope and the Archbishop of Canterbury each possessing holy orders "excellent of their kind" (p. 52). Just how orders which are null and void can be "excellent of their kind" is a bit difficult to understand. Among the *errata* the following were noted: for "closura" read instead "clausura" (p. 2); "Calisto" should be "Callisto" (p. 10, *passim*); Pius IV should be Paul IV (p. 77); and for "Ceretti" read instead "Cerretti" (p. 216).

Space forbids one to do more than mention some of the very interesting bits of information which are found in this book, such, for example, as the opinion of Merry del Val in August, 1897, that with wise and prudent guidance Canada might become the bulwark of the Catholic Church "on the American Continent" (p. 187); that as late as May,

1914, Merry del Val as Secretary of State had excluded the name of Archbishop della Chiesa of Bologna from the roster of new cardinals, but that Pius X had personally inserted it in his final list (p. 190); that David Fleming, O.F.M., a consultor of the Holy Office, who was supposedly quite friendly with a number of the American bishops, was not beyond indulging in 1897 in some strong jibes at the Americans in his letters to Gasquet; the evidences of what seemed from their correspondence to be a rather close friendship between Gasquet and Merry del Val in the years 1897-1914 (pp. 186-91) gave way when Gasquet is found telling Fleming in a letter of Nov. 29, 1903: "It is very curious that you say what I have also felt that Merry del Val cannot be relied on as a friend. Now he has *arrived,* his peculiar *twist* will be accentuated" (p. 199). Mention should also be made of the very interesting brief chapter on the succession to the See of Westminster on the death of Cardinal Vaughan in 1903 wherein Gasquet, it would seem, lost out by a very narrow margin (pp. 80-90). On that question a number of reviewers and readers of this book have had their say in print. It reminds me of the splendid sketch of Gasquet which William Francis Brown, Auxiliary Bishop of Southwark, included in his little volume of autobiography called *Through Windows of Memory* (London, 1946), wherein he stated about Gasquet and the succession question:

> He spoke a good deal about the matter to me and others, but I never quite made out whether he would really have liked to be Archbishop of Westminster, apart from the prestige of being chosen for such a great position; but he did seem to feel having been passed over on an issue which had nothing to do with his personal qualifications. But I am sure he never took it to heart (pp. 117-18).

In an essay entitled "Biography in Specimens" in *The Month* of March, 1954, Sir Shane Leslie maintains that good biography leads to light on both the subject and the writer with an illumination of the soul of the former and of the style of the latter (p. 160). In his memoir of Cardinal Gasquet both of these ends may be said to have been in some measure attained. In my opinion he not infrequently claims too much for Gasquet without giving supporting evidence to prove his claims, but all things considered the present memoir succeeds in painting a rather distinct picture. It remains now for a more definitive effort to draw the full portrait, and especially to remedy the principal omission in this book, namely, the role which Cardinal Gasquet played in the emergence of Downside Abbey and School to the enviable position they occupy today in English Catholic life.

JOHN TRACY ELLIS

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN WORLD AFFAIRS. Edited by Waldemar Gurian and M. A. Fitzsimons. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954. Pp. xi + 420. $4.25.

This symposium consists of a preface signed by the two co-editors, an introduction by the late Dr. Gurian, and twenty-six contributions all concerned in some way with the Church in the contemporary world. According to the preface, "the various chapters of this book, in spite of all differences of approach, reiterate Father Murray's restatement of the traditional conception of two perfect societies, the Church and the state" (p. ix).

Father Murray's essay "On the Structure of the Church-State Problem" is the lead article in the book. His ultimate practical conclusion is that "As a matter of method, it would seem that the present problem of Church and State could be most fruitfully discussed under conscious abstraction from those categories (e.g., 'union' vs. 'separation') into which the discussion settled during the nineteenth century" (p. 32). Now a great many pontifical documents on Church and state written during the nineteenth century, and some written during the twentieth (including the allocution *Ci riesce,* delivered last Dec. 6), condemn precisely the absolute separation of Church and state. Either conscious or unconscious abstraction from this "category" would thus appear to be most unfortunate for the work of any teacher of Catholic truth.

Another article of interest in this symposium is Father McAvoy's essay, "The Catholic Church in the United States." His remarks on the Catholic University of America are at least noteworthy. According to Father McAvoy, "The Catholic University of America, as its name implies, was intended to be a national institution, beginning first with a theological graduate school. It has not been successful in either aim because of the opposition of some of the bishops who wished to establish their own theological schools and because of the controversies over nationalism which afflicted its early years and alienated much support. In those departments of the University where funds have been available the Washington institution has achieved real scholarship, but so long as the support of the University is diocesan the future of the University is dependent upon the support of the bishops; and that has not been sufficient either in finances or in students and faculty to make it a strong institution" (pp. 373 f.).

Both the propriety and the accuracy of Father McAvoy's observations on the subject of the University are somewhat open to question. It may seem somewhat presumptuous to dismiss the University as a failure merely on the grounds that there are other theological schools in the